

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXIII

JANUARY, 1930

NUMBER 1

MEN AND TENDENCIES IN GERMAN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

JULIUS SEELYE BIXLER

SMITH COLLEGE

THE student of present-day German religious thought cannot fail to be impressed by the diversity of the attitudes which it expresses. German religious belief runs the entire gamut of possibilities. Side by side one finds authoritarianism, rationalism, mysticism, a devotion to the past and a dominant interest in the future, a religion based on scholarly research and another grounded in romantic experience, a cloistered individualism and a pragmatic interest in human welfare. Students of Aquinas, of Kant, and of Schleiermacher, disciples of Keyserling and of Steiner, ecclesiastics, nature-lovers, and workers for a new social order, all are active today, and through their efforts a new series of general philosophical conceptions is rising from the ruins of the war.

Yet the combined impression which they give is not that of chaos. Differences among German thinkers only reveal an underlying unity of purpose. That these thinkers are able to so great a degree to ward off the cynical pessimism to which they might easily have succumbed is a tribute both to the resiliency of the German nature and to the insistent appeal of the religious quest itself. The task of readjustment is for the modern German particularly difficult because before the war his view of the world of values and its relation to ordinary life was so intimately connected with his loyalty to his country. But he has allowed his disillusionment to touch only the externals. His faith in the world of ideal values and in its meaning for his life is as strong as ever. Nor is it possible to dismiss the activity in religious thinking of present-day Germany as nothing but a means of "escape from reality." That it would be pleasant to escape from the thought of defeat, revolution, the world's hatred, be-

reavement, poverty, reparation problems, and huge taxes is undeniable. But the scholarly creativeness of these people has meant an approach to reality, instead of an escape from it. And the same is true of the less theoretical and more practical forms which the religious interest has taken. The love of nature and interest in social problems shown in the youth-movement, the zest for athletics among all classes, the widespread interest in folk-dancing, the sensitiveness for the best in art and music, the eagerness to work for the rehabilitation of the Fatherland, the rush for a university education, all point to an eagerness to search out opportunities for new creation and to make the best use of them.

So we find that even in the comparatively limited field of religious philosophy it is necessary to take note of at least five groups of workers representing five main lines of thought. These groups are first the Roman Catholic theologians, secondly the group of 'phenomenologists,' whose thinking on its religious side is allied to Roman Catholicism, thirdly the 'theologians of crisis' (the most influential group definitely associated with Protestantism), fourthly those neo-kantian philosophers whose sympathies lie with a liberal Protestantism, and fifthly an unclassified group whose members differ among themselves in most details but have in common an affiliation with Protestantism and an interest in the problems of theology.

Whether Roman Catholicism is actually making many converts in Germany today is open to question, but that as a system of belief it is attracting an increasing amount of attention there can be little doubt. The reason is partly political, but in philosophical circles the critical realism of Catholic theology is arousing fresh interest, and the fact that 'Phänomenologie,' the most influential intellectual movement in modern Germany, contains many elements drawn from scholasticism has added to the prestige of Catholicism. In the realm of art, also, a new interest in the work of the early Middle Ages is apparent. But the strongest influence of all is a more subtle motive. When standards are changing and the old certainties seem to have disappeared, the offer of an infallible authority, hallowed by the ages, as a bulwark against subjectivism and chaos is not an empty

one. And when the doubting and vacillating individual finds that his needs are ministered to by a clergy skilled in the use of approved 'psychological' methods, the appeal is hard to resist.

Philosophically, Roman Catholicism offers today as formerly a belief in the world as a real object of knowledge independent of consciousness, and in values as not created but uncovered and recognized by the mind. Man is a free being. God is revealed on the natural plane in his works of creation which are studied by science, and on the supernatural plane in the truth which is established through Christ and taught with the highest authority. This authority is the church, which both philosophically and historically vindicates its right to distinguish true from false revelation and to enable the eye of faith, aided by divine grace, to accept what is revealed.

An acute Catholic thinker is Erich Przywara,¹ professor of theology in Munich, whose views may be taken as typical of the present-day German defender of Catholicism. To point out the fallacies in opposing theories Przywara offers a nine-fold classification of non-catholic religious beliefs. Three main forms of philosophy are based, he says, on their interpretation of the structure of religious experience, each having three subdivisions. The first form is the philosophy of immanence. It harks back to "original feeling" and reaches into the depths of the human personality. The three subtypes are first the 'pure immanence' of Schleiermacher, the romanticists, and the early Natorp; secondly the view of Simmel, and in part of Spranger, that the divine is found in the dynamic rhythm of life; thirdly the 'vital immanence' of the French, English, and Italian modernists, for whom God is in the 'infinite content' in which the 'infinity of feeling' crystallizes. The second main form is the philosophy of transcendence. Here the first subtype is that Deism which sees God as an absentee clockmaker; the second is found in the later Arabic Aristotelianism or in Hegel, where God is discovered in that process of thought by which things are created; the third is Neoplatonism, where the object is merged with the subject. The third main form stands between immanence and transcendence and may be called 'transcendality.' The first subtype here is

¹ E. Przywara, *Religionsphilosophie katholischer Theologie*, München, 1927.

the neo-kantianism of the Marburg school, which views God as the Ideal toward which the whole creation strives but which it never reaches. The second subtype, as in Fichte, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Scheler, finds God not in the Ideal governing the striving but in the striving itself. For the third subtype, for instance, the neo-kantianism of the Baden school, God is the pure value which stands objectively over against the striving process.

Each of these Przywara finds defective. Immanence makes God too human, transcendence makes him too inaccessible, 'transcendality' furnishes only an 'explosive unity,' or unity of contradictions, since its god-ideal is at the same time above and in the striving process. Roman Catholicism resolves the paradox by resorting to the formula 'analogia entis.' The world of creation is the analogy of God. It is similar to God through the common possession of a unity of 'what' and 'that' (*Sosein* and *Dasein*), yet different from him in that this unity in God's case is an identity which belongs to his nature, while in the creature it is only a 'tension-unity.' God is thus, claims Przywara, absolute, and independent of all creation, yet not inaccessible. The formula also helps us to understand the relation of absolute truth to the relative knower. Kant and Hegel asserted that the relation was to be understood in terms of identity and contradiction. This appears in Kant's contrast between the absoluteness of the transcendental subject and the relativity of the empirical subject, and in Hegel's resolution of this antinomy in the dialectic. For Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, however, the relation is one of analogy. 'Analogia entis' expresses the relation between the being of valid truth and the becoming of the knowing subject as that of the analogy which the human 'tension-unity' between essence and existence bears to the real identity in God's nature between Truth and Ego. So for Kantian or Hegelian idealism the problem becomes that of the nature of contradiction; for Catholic theology it is that of 'tensions' (*Spannungen*).

Przywara goes on to claim that the nine philosophies he has named tend to make God a mere function of consciousness. For them God is not the absolute, but an attempt to raise to the 'absolutistic' level a thing in itself relative. Catholicism

achieves an absolute because it reaches out beyond the whole immanence-transcendence controversy. Religion is neither the feeling of an infinite in one's self nor creature-feeling before the Creator, but the combined consciousness of God in me and of myself in God. It is expressed in the familiar: "Thou wouldst not seek me hadst thou not already found me." Reflection does not create our relation to God, but follows it. This principle applies both to thought and to the more vague 'feeling' or 'experience.' God is revealed, not to the mystic who seeks rest or enjoyment in his experience, but only to one who in piety and in respect for God's absoluteness approaches him in devotion, seeking him for his own sake. God is not that which works for the health of the soul or for the welfare of society, but that mystery which, sought as an end in itself, may through divine grace bring good to the seeker. The principle of 'analogia entis' thus allows intercourse between the two worlds of Creator and creation without obscuring their fundamental dissimilarity or limiting God's freedom through any requirement of human thinking or feeling. Catholic mysticism does justice to the immanent side of religion; the Catholic cult to the transcendent side. The combination also of Augustine's emphasis on that which is unchanging with Thomas Aquinas's interest in the dynamic expresses both the static quality of the divine ideal and the restlessness of human effort. The Augustinian element in Catholicism brings out man's participation in God's nature, the Thomistic element the distinctive nature of the creature as such; unity for Augustine is given prior to multiplicity, for Thomas through it. Augustine is inclined to say: Love God, and let the consequences take care of themselves. Thomas stays more closely by reason, and has more respect for the law of causality put into human life by a divine dispensation. So the philosophies of Augustine and of Thomas have been historically the concrete expression of the two sides of 'analogia entis,' which itself affirms the fact of difference from God in similarity to him. Catholicism through its inclusion of both views is the universal religion.

So much for the argumentative side of Catholicism as developed recently by one of its protagonists. Whatever appeal

the Catholic church has for modern Germans may be supposed to reside in the emotional satisfaction it offers rather than in speculations like these. But this type of intellectual backing is offered to substantiate the claim that Catholic philosophy is entirely consonant with the demands of human reason. Let us now turn to the new and influential brand of German philosophy known as 'phenomenology,' which, though it is not officially Catholic, nor even a religious philosophy except in some of its implications, yet has much in common with scholasticism, and as the most important philosophical movement in Germany today helps to show one direction which German thought is taking. Phenomenology attempts to return to the 'phenomenon' not in the Kantian but in the Greek sense of 'that which appears' or 'presents itself.' It tries to reach the essential thing which appears in consciousness and to cleanse it of all extraneous attributes. The intention of its founder, Edmund Husserl of Freiburg, is to set up the criterion of intuitive clearness as a means to absolute assurance. By resorting to a process of 'bracketing,' or 'exclusion,' which he calls the process of 'phenomenological reduction,' Husserl² means to rule out all questions of existence in fact or of relation to sense-experience or to the world of space and time. Once this is done, conceptions as they present themselves in consciousness should become perfectly clear and should be immediately recognizable as valid or invalid. The essence of any given conception when thus viewed intuitively reveals itself as possible (in the sense of conceivable) or as fit only to be rejected. When the fundamental conceptions of philosophy and of the sciences have been analyzed by this method, and their essential nature has been revealed, the path should be clear for further progress than has yet been made. Thus Husserl turns our attention to the essences in which the scholastics were interested, puts us on the trail of the 'quidditas' of Thomas Aquinas, substitutes once more immediate evidence for rational proof, and takes us to intuition as an infallible guide. This means that we are brought again to that view of life for which the highest form of ac-

² E. Husserl, *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, Halle, 1922.

tivity is 'contemplatio,' or 'theoria' in the strict sense. Catholic writers have claimed also that the system of evidences which Husserl expects to find through his intuitive process closely resembles the God who reveals himself in philosophy to the eye of faith. Husserl's immediate evidence is further taken by Catholics as similar to strict religious insight. His attack on formalism, rationalism, and naturalism, and his appeal to other guides than those which sense-experience provides, have been welcomed by thinkers both Catholic and Protestant.

Scheler,³ who before his sudden death in 1928 was an important member of the phenomenological group, was for a time an active Catholic. His work was hailed by some as of great significance in pointing the road which led away from Kant and back to Plato. Some Catholic theologians, however, considered that he laid undue stress on the Augustinian and intuitive element in scholasticism, as contrasted with the rationalism of Thomas. Scheler was true to the realistic Catholic tradition throughout, and his defense of the independent reality of values, based on his insistence on the independence of the feeling and appreciating function from the knowing function in man, is an interesting contribution to modern religious thought. At the time of his death, however, Scheler was not a member of the Catholic church.

Heidegger,⁴ who is now looked on as the future leader of the phenomenological group, was born in the Catholic Schwarzwald, trained for the Catholic priesthood, became prominent in the Catholic youth-movement, but now, as professor of philosophy at Freiburg, has only private connections with the church, if indeed he has any. His philosophy shows decided Catholic influences. Heidegger's great problem is that of the nature of being, and his ontological interest carries him at once back to Aristotle and Thomas. His inquiry soon takes him, however, beyond the nature of being in the abstract to the nature of man's existence and on to the meaning for human life of the cosmic setting in which it is found. His religious interest is shown in the way he turns to words having a moral and re-

³ M. Scheler, *Vom Ewigen im Menschen*, Leipzig, 1923.

⁴ M. Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, Halle, 1927.

ligious connotation to find the answer to supposedly ontological questions. Catholic influences appear in his use of the conception of fear and in the prominent place which he assigns to death. His generalization on 'Der Mensch' has been called a variation on the Catholic 'Adam-theme,' and his treatment of 'Zeitlichkeit,' which has "kein zeitliches Nacheinander," is said by some to be his translation of the idea of a non-temporal rebirth won through Christ. The claim is also made that Heidegger's attempt to turn existence into an 'essence' of being forces him to the scholastic teaching of the final tension between essence and existence in the creature as contrasted with their identity in God. But the attempt to identify phenomenology too closely with Catholicism, or indeed to define it too strictly as in itself a unified philosophy, is in the end doomed to failure. Phenomenology is an attitude and a method, and little beside. Its adherents are at present too much at odds with one another to permit a prophecy as to its future.

Turning now to Protestantism, we are at once struck by the fact that its most important movement has more than a little in common both with Catholicism and with Heidegger's branch of phenomenology. Karl Barth⁵ and his associates in developing the 'theology of crisis,' or 'theology of dialectic,' have definitely set their faces against the humanistic emphasis of liberal Protestantism, have championed a thorough-going theocentric faith, and have stressed anew the ideas of sin, grace, and the need of supernatural revelation and salvation. Barth claims to have found special significance in Kutter's affirmation, "God is God," with its corollary that God's ways are not man's ways and that God is not bound by man's standards. For Barth, as much as for the Catholics, it is heresy to make God a function of man's thought. God is transcendent and sovereign, as Calvin said. Barth has further been influenced by Kierkegaard,⁶ to whom Heidegger's debt is also plain. From him Barth has taken the contrast between the realm of eternity and the realm of time, and the need of reaching out of the latter into the for-

⁵ K. Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (Eng. trans. by Douglas Horton of *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*), Boston, 1928.

⁶ S. Kierkegaard, *Entweder - Oder*, Dresden, 1927.

mer. From him also he has drawn his almost pragmatic insistence that our answer to religious questions lies in the practical rather than the theoretical department of experience, and should be determined by the fact that we are participators in life's struggle and not merely bystanders. We must have what Barth calls "existentielles Denken," that is, thinking which is rooted in the life-situation in which we find ourselves, the kind of thinking which Heidegger gives us when he rests all on the analysis of the 'Dasein,' or relation of the human to the cosmic scheme of being. The life-situation turns out to be a serious one filled both with grave responsibilities and with severe disillusionments as to the natural goodness of man. With Dostoevski Barth holds that despair brings us to God. The pessimism which is our natural lot as we view a world where man preys on man, can be relieved only by opening ourselves to influences from the eternal.

Barth's real achievement is his success in making the theocentric emphasis in Germany at a time when defeat and revolution threatened to lead to chaos, and in warding off pessimism as to human life by pointing to the realm of the eternal. He has also definitely thrown down the gauntlet to the cherished German view that religion is a branch of 'culture' and is to be understood and estimated by the standards which culture provides. In his affirmation of the uniqueness of religion Barth marks a return to Schleiermacher. In other respects, however, the two are at opposite poles. Schleiermacher is in fact the *bête noire* of the whole Barthian movement, on account of his teaching as to the immanence of God and man's ability to reach God through his own deepest self. For this newer group God is absolute and transcendent. Between Him and humanity lies a chasm which only a unique revelation can bridge.

Friedrich Gogarten ⁷ of Jena echoes Barth's plea for a return to the rugged and independent faith of the Reformers, and prophesies death for the Protestant church if it continues to treat theology as a branch of the history of philosophy, to concern itself with ethical movements as if they were of truly religious significance, or to regard the aesthetic experience as if it were

⁷ F. Gogarten, *Die Schuld der Kirche gegen die Welt*, Jena, 1929.

allied to religion. Religion and the church must return to God, their author and founder. Gogarten differs from Barth chiefly in making a Lutheran emphasis where Barth inclines to be Calvinistic. Bultmann⁸ of Marburg has developed similar ideas while working in the field of New Testament criticism. His use of the word 'Entscheidung,' that is, 'decision' or 'crisis,' has given its name to the whole group. For Bultmann the crisis comes when a man is confronted by the teachings of Jesus and realizes their import for life. By them he is brought face to face with the significance of the Kingdom of God. Complete renunciation and complete obedience are then demanded of him. Bultmann and Heidegger were for a time colleagues at Marburg, and they have in common the idea that clearness, or intuitive conceivability, is the most natural criterion for truth. Emil Brunner⁹ of Zürich is the systematizer of the movement, of which Barth is the herald and prophet. Brunner claims that the only serious question is the question of God, and that this is in fact the question of Christ, since it is only Christ's life that reveals God. God can be known only through that which is God. Religion is either grounded in revelation from God or it is the product of wish and phantasy. We do not have a series of graded steps leading through religious heroes and geniuses from man to God, but one definite occasion in history, one unique life where God and man have come into contact. Christ was the Logos, which means not that he was a philosophical principle but the Eternal Son of the Father. He is the Mediator, who unites the two sides separated by the eternal rift in nature and history. Religion is not based on universal or rational principles but on the supernatural revelation which God has vouchsafed.

This 'theology of crisis,' like many movements for social reform, came into Germany from Switzerland. Barth lived in Switzerland originally, and Thurneysen¹⁰ and Brunner are still there. In spite of its anti-humanistic and in a sense anti-social emphasis it seems fair to class it also as a social movement, since it grew out of Barth's own passionate desire for the social wel-

⁸ R. Bultmann, *Jesus*, 1926.

⁹ E. Brunner, *Der Mittler*, Tübingen, 1927.

¹⁰ E. Thurneysen (with K. Barth), *Zur inneren Lage des Christentums*, München, 1920.

fare of the masses, coupled with his profound disappointment at the voting of the war-credits by the German socialists. The influence, however, of the movement in Germany, while still extensive, is now apparently on the wane. It has some adherents outside the church among theological students, and has attracted the favorable notice of such a figure as Keyserling. On the whole, however, it has been viewed unfavorably in university circles, and although it has drawn the interest of some Catholics, it is now opposed by a strong group within its own Protestant field. A lasting influence seems to be precluded by its proneness to insist that twentieth-century religion shall use terms and conceptions drawn from an age with an entirely different philosophical view.

The crisis-theologians have gone a long way from Kant, and indeed find Kant's subordination of religion to ethics as objectionable as Schleiermacher's path to God through inner experience. Yet Kant holds his own in German thought as a whole, and the movement from Hegel back to Kant gains momentum steadily. Neo-kantianism has suffered some setbacks at the hands of phenomenology, but it still numbers influential adherents.

Neo-kantian philosophers in Germany have in general followed a different line from that of neo-kantian theologians. The theologians have done little to overcome Kant's dualism. Indeed their development of the idea of the practical reason has separated religion completely from intellectual assurance, and has confined it to a realm of values whose relation to existence is anything but clear. Ritschlianism still has influence in Germany, but more as a tendency to emphasize the value-bringing experience implicit in the life of Christ than as a definite theological movement. It has had no prominent exponents since the death of Wilhelm Herrmann in 1922. The neo-kantian philosophy, however, has worked to overcome the dualism in Kant, and to treat religion as a part of the realm of necessary truths which the mind must recognize because they are bound up with its own way of functioning. Hermann Cohen,¹¹ founder

¹¹ H. Cohen, *Der Begriff der Religion im System der Philosophie*, Giessen, 1915; *Religion und Sittlichkeit*, Berlin, 1907.

of the 'Marburg' branch of neo-kantianism, seemed at first to complete the practical identification of religion with ethics which Kant had begun. Resorting to the Old Testament for his illustrations, he argued that religion began in superstition but was transfused with ethics by the work of the great prophets. The growth of the messianic conception meant also a new idea of the unity of mankind. Toward the end of his life Cohen came to believe that religion is different from ethics, since ethics relates to mankind in the mass, to his nature as man, whereas in religion God speaks to the individual, offering forgiveness according to men's individual needs. Cohen's ideal, like that of Kant, was mathematical assurance in knowledge. His philosophy is strict idealism, holding that the primary thing is thought, that it has an active and creative character, whereas sense-experience is disconnected, incomplete, and fragmentary. The categories do not come from experience but are its presuppositions, by which it is made possible. The bases of thought correspond with the bases of being.

Natorp,¹² another member of the 'Marburg school,' also tried to ground religion on the structure of the mind itself. Religion is ethical to the core, yet it is also, as Schleiermacher held, intimately related to feeling. This feeling, however, is not a special province of consciousness, existing by the side of thought and will, but is a basic experience underlying all else. Religion is feeling for the infinite; yet as the infinite is not properly an object, it is better to speak of it as feeling which is infinite in itself. The infinite discloses itself within human hearts. Religion should take as its special task the unifying of the mind's activities. It should fill the entire bed of the stream of consciousness with its rising tide of life, yet should not overflow its banks to lose itself in a transcendent world. Religion operates within the bounds of humanity. It is primarily concerned with ethics, as Kant saw, but it also works with the data of logic and aesthetics. It is an inner life-giving quality. Natorp's view that religion occupies no separate field is contradicted by Görland,¹³ a substantial if somewhat obscure thinker, who claims in

¹² P. Natorp, *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der Humanität*, Tübingen, 1908.

¹³ A. Görland, *Religionsphilosophie*, Berlin, 1923.

a book published in 1923 that religion brings with it a new and unique element. The ethical attitude occupies a different plane from the scientific, since an ethical interest involves new considerations of value. The aesthetic interest brings still more factors into play. The material datum itself is not altered, but with our changing view new possibilities in our experience of it disclose themselves. But this progression and unfolding of possibilities helps us to understand that much abused term, 'thing in itself.' It means simply 'direction,' or concretion, progression from simple to more complicated experience. 'Transcendence' is not a position in space but a direction pointing toward fulness of experience. In this direction lies God as the limit of experience and knowledge. Along with truth, beauty, and goodness, we must find a fourth value, holiness. 'Ahnung' exists in addition to thinking, feeling, and willing. In it, as Fries and Jacobi realized, lies religion.

The members of the 'Marburg school' have refused to admit an unknowable, and have helped to clear up the obscurity of the 'thing in itself.' They have, however, been criticised for limiting themselves too exclusively to problems of knowledge and not realizing that Kantianism might be made a new philosophy of 'culture.' The second great group of neo-kantians, the so-called 'Baden school,' have been less concerned with mathematical assurance and more interested in historical richness and concreteness. Hence they have paid less attention to the deduction of the content of knowledge from the form furnished by the understanding, and more to the non-deducible element which is experienced rather than rationally constructed. This they consider a natural development of Kant's own position. In a much quoted phrase from Windelband,¹⁴ leader of this group, "Kant verstehen heisst über ihn hinausgehen." The idealistic emphasis on the primacy of abstract knowledge remains, but a philosophy of values is developed as a superstructure.

Windelband argues that since Plato philosophy has been too exclusively concerned with general principles. Science has won its victories through the discovery of general laws. Now, how-

¹⁴ W. Windelband, *Präludien*, Tübingen, 1924.

ever, history is beginning to come into its own, and history deals with particular things, individual men, exceptional insights, original views, unpredictable events. It includes the achievements not merely of the common man but of the man of genius. The study of the individual is perhaps more important than the study of the universal, since it is in our perception of individuality and unlikeness that our feelings of worth are most keen. History shows us the way developing norms of 'culture' affect the individual. They gradually permeate his every-day experience, and without breaking into the causal series succeed in bringing about a conscious selection in favor of that which is of value. A man's realization of the existence of standards is itself apparently a kind of psychical force which works for the right decision without interfering either with moral autonomy or the law of causation. The task of ethics is to bring these immanent standards ever more vividly to consciousness.

Religion seeks 'the holy' as the ground which is common to truth, goodness, and beauty. It finds this ground in the distinction between *Sollen* and *Müssen*, between the norm, or that which should be, and the natural law, or that which is. We cannot solve the antinomy by saying that conformity to the social will satisfies both members. The individual may resist the social will by recognizing a higher principle. The will of the community may represent a higher plane than the selfish whim of the individual, but the recognition of this fact itself points to the still higher plane of absolute values, apprehended in the most certain of our experiences — 'the holy.' It is disclosed in and through that higher life of reason which as men we are privileged to share. That is why the great opponent of religion is the positivism which denies any super-empirical realm. Religion is man's relation to values in their transcendence. The desire for unity leads to the view of God as 'the holy,' including both ideal and real. Yet if God be the one principle of substance and causation, the problem of evil must remain ever insoluble.

Rickert,¹⁵ who still lectures brilliantly at Heidelberg, protests against the attempt to ground a theory of values in psy-

¹⁵ H. Rickert, *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft*, Tübingen, 1926.

chology, claiming that there are other questions which must be answered before the psychological question can even be raised. Inquiring into the nature of knowledge, we are confronted by the fact that values dominate even our judgments as to truth. When we claim truth for our opinions, we presuppose a belief in truth as a value to be attained. To deny the objective validity of values outside of the subjective experience of the individual is to deny truth and to reduce science to chaos. Such a denial would itself presuppose its own truth. Since values disclose themselves in 'culture,' Rickert would distinguish 'Kulturwissenschaften' from 'Naturwissenschaften,' deeming this a less ambiguous term than the more usual 'Geisteswissenschaften.' In history we find more promising material for a theory of values than in the natural or psychological sciences. It is true that we must not be content with the merely historical, and that 'Historismus' is an evil as much to be avoided as 'Psychologismus.' But the path to the super-empirical, super-historical world leads through history. Studying history, we find, along with objective ethical, logical, and aesthetic values, the religious value of holiness, or completeness, which man must set as an ideal against his own incompleteness. This does not prove the existence of God, but it hardly needs to. Most cultural values are not logically demonstrable. One feels their power, however, and can adopt an appreciative attitude toward them even when certain existential questions are ruled out of court.

Our last group includes a number of thinkers who do not form a school but have in common a sympathy with liberal Protestantism. Among those who have recently died, mention should first be made of Eucken¹⁶ the philosopher and of Troeltsch, who for a long period of his earlier career was a professor of theology. Throughout Eucken's teaching career in Jena he carried on a vigorous campaign against all forms of naturalism. In good Kantian fashion he believed in a twofold source of experience, sensual and spiritual, and claimed that the presence of the latter as a synthetic and form-giving element rendered the materialistic interpretation of human life impos-

¹⁶ R. Eucken, *The Truth of Religion* (Eng. trans. of *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion*, 1901), New York, 1911; *Lebenserinnerungen*, Leipzig, 1922.

sible. Eucken's 'activism' also had much in common with pragmatism. There are spiritual truths, he argued, whose full import we realize only when we espouse them actively and enter vigorously into the fight to make them prevail. A negative movement away from nature and the realm of the sensuous is the first step to both practical and theoretical achievement. The fact that we can deny the given, and work for that which is not apparent, shows the creative part which humanity plays in the making of reality. Nor is our own autonomy lost when we realize that through us works a larger entity, the great Spiritual Life. For human coöperation is needed if the Spirit is finally to triumph. Eucken is an idealist in his epistemology, akin to pragmatism in his emphasis on human creativity, an activist in his view of the essence of consciousness as energy of the self, and a personalist in his belief in interaction between subject and object. No teacher of the last generation in Germany is today more often referred to with respect and affection than he.

Troeltsch,¹⁷ on the other hand, had great influence just before his death in 1923 but is less mentioned now. His most distinctive contribution lay in his suggestion that religious ideas may be governed by a priori laws which are as valid and necessary for knowledge as the laws governing other branches of the understanding. This religious a priori relates all reality and all value to an absolute substance and norm. The idea of establishing religion in the structure of the understanding itself was for a time widely popular. It is not long since we heard of the German youth going out "with poles and torches" on the quest for the religious a priori. Troeltsch attempted to relate the study of religion to history and psychology as well as to philosophy. His interest in the building of a theory of values through the study of history allies him in some respects to the members of the 'Baden school.'

The list of living teachers, both theologians and philosophers, whose work is allied to the thought of modern Protestantism could be extended almost indefinitely. Otto¹⁸ at Marburg is

¹⁷ E. Troeltsch, *Gesammelte Schriften*, 4 vols., Tübingen, 1912-1925.

¹⁸ R. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (Eng. trans. by J. W. Harvey of *Das Heilige*), London, 1923.

better known in America than some of the others because of the English translation of his book "Das Heilige." Otto's attempt to find an unassailable place for religion in the irrational element of religious experiences has had a wide influence in Germany. His treatment of the 'numinous' as an a priori category has perhaps contributed both a new term and a new conception to religious philosophy. In his view that religion is independent of ethics he marks a turning from the position of the Kantians toward that of Schleiermacher. Heim¹⁹ of Tübingen, a popular teacher of theology, has with ingenuity tried to show that the world apparently governed by mechanistic law actually contains countless other possibilities than those that have been realized, and, since it exists in consciousness, is not an impersonal collocation of atoms but a living field for the development of religious truth. Wobbermin²⁰ at Göttingen is interested in the attempt to give religion a metaphysical basis. Tillich²¹ at Frankfurt is working at problems of ontology, and is one of the most active in the endeavor to make religion effective toward the bettering of social and economic conditions. Schweitzer,²² when he is not on the mission field at Lambarene in Africa, stays at his Schwarzwald home in Königsfeld, writing still in the field of New Testament scholarship and constructing a 'life-affirming' philosophy. With his knowledge of science, his passion for objective truth, his artistic ability, and his success in active philanthropy he is one of Germany's most versatile personalities and an inspiration to the entire country. The philosophy of values continues to attract many, including Bauch²³ of Jena (whose views in many ways resemble those of Rickert), Spranger²⁴ of Berlin, a pupil of Dilthey and student of the psychological and philosophical significance of history, Stern²⁵ of Hamburg, who calls himself a 'personalist,' and Cassirer, also of Hamburg,

¹⁹ K. Heim, *Glaubensgewissheit*, 3d ed., Leipzig, 1923.

²⁰ G. Wobbermin, *Das Wesen der Religion*, 1922.

²¹ P. Tillich, *Die religiöse Lage der Gegenwart*, Berlin, 1926.

²² A. Schweitzer, *Kulturphilosophie*, 1923.

²³ B. Bauch, *Anfangsgründe der Philosophie*, Gotha, 1920.

²⁴ E. Spranger, *Types of Men* (Eng. trans. by P. J. W. Pigors of *Lebensformen*, Halle, 1928).

²⁵ W. Stern, *Person und Sache*, 3 vols., 1906, 1908, 1924.

who is greatly interested in the new intellectual attack on problems of 'culture.' Groups of religiously minded individuals gather annually around Keyserling in Darmstadt and Johannes Müller in the Bavarian Alps.

But why lengthen the list? Enough has been said to show some of the varieties in German religious thought and to suggest also the intensity with which German thinkers are prompted to reach out beyond agnosticism, pessimism, or hedonism to a realm where values are less obvious but more real. The Germans still seem to have an unusual capacity for discovering the cosmic significance in the human drama, and for unravelling the various influences — natural, psychological, philosophical, historical — which play upon man as he acts his part. History for them is not a dead body of facts but a living stream of experience; philosophy not a series of barren formulae but a revelation of new avenues of thought; religion not an escape, but an experience of contact with new dimensions of being. The future should bring in Germany new conquests for the intellect and the spirit.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS GOSPEL FRAGMENTS

RODERIC DUNKERLEY

GLOUCESTER, ENGLAND

It is with five of the Christian fragments unearthed at Oxyrhynchus by Grenfell and Hunt, under the auspices of the Egypt Exploration Fund, that I propose to deal here. It will be convenient to quote these fragments as OP (Oxyrhynchus Papyri), and the discoverers of them as GH (Grenfell and Hunt), using the enumeration adopted in their large volumes (not that of the popular reprint of April 1904). The fragments to be considered are Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654, 655, 840, and 1224; the first two of these (No. 1 and No. 654) are the so-called 'Sayings of Jesus' and 'New Sayings of Jesus'; No. 655 is the 'Fragment of a Lost Gospel,' containing a page of sayings; No. 840 the 'Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel,' published in 1908; No. 1224 the fragments entitled 'Uncanonical Gospel,' published in 1914.

I

A considerable discussion sprang up around the discovery in 1897 of OP 1 and in 1903 of OP 654, 655. It is not possible here even to pass it in brief review; a bibliography up to 1908 will be found in Bernhard Pick's "Paralipomena." A later and more select statement is given by H. G. Evelyn White in "The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus" (1920), which is the most complete edition of the first two fragments and indispensable for the study of them and of the questions they raise. The other fragments have been much less discussed.

With the reconstruction of the text we cannot deal here. Evelyn White gathers and discusses all the principal attempts at restoration, and adds his own, which in several points differ from all previous suggestions. Where there is such wide diversity of view it is evidently necessary to tread with great care, and conclusions based upon such reconstructions must be recognized as tentative only.

Evelyn White's conclusions may be briefly summarized thus. He believes that OP 1 and 654 are fragments from different copies of the same work (the first is a page from a codex; the second, part of a roll), and that this document was a collection of sayings; on the other hand 655 — which he does not study in detail — he regards as a portion of a gospel. Thus far he agrees with GH and most scholars, Vernon Bartlet however, as we shall see, differing at several points. As regards the nature of this document, Evelyn White rejects the view of GH and others that it was a genuine and independent collection, ultimately connected with a first-hand source of information though influenced by the thought of the apostolic and post-apostolic age, and maintains that while there is definite dependence upon the canonical gospels, yet the fragment shows such clear homogeneity of composition that the sayings must be regarded as extracts from a single secondary or apocryphal gospel. The suggestion of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, advanced by Harnack and others, he disallows, as he does that of the Gospel of Thomas discussed by GH and Taylor; he then argues at considerable length in favor of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, maintaining that "the peculiar relation of the Sayings and of the Gospel to the Synoptics and to the Fourth Gospel are identical," and that in their parallelism, use of Semitic idioms, and familiarity with Hebrew literature, the two documents are alike.¹ That one of the sayings (654) is quoted by Clement of Alexandria² as from this Gospel is a strong point in his favor. His view of the Gospel according to the Hebrews is that it arose at Alexandria³ amongst the more scrupulous Jews as an elaboration of the canonical gospels, with the addition of some traditional matter of which he has not a very high opinion; he regards it as probably the same work as that called by Origen the Gospel according to the Twelve, differing here from Schmidtke⁴ (whom he had not read) and most other writers.

¹ H. G. Evelyn White, p. lxviii.

² Strom. ii. 9; v. 14.

³ He is not quite consistent on this point, suggesting in a footnote on p. lv that it originated in Palestine.

⁴ Texte und Untersuchungen, XXXVII, p. 1.

There are a number of reasons why I cannot assent to this position:

(1) There is an evident probability that in such a collection of excerpts the same order would be followed as in the original work, and we know that the Gospel according to the Hebrews took quite a different line from this.

(2) We have considerable knowledge of what that gospel contained, and it is difficult to see how it can also have included such a long series of sayings (OP 1 bears the page-number 11), when we remember that it was shorter than St. Matthew.⁵

(3) That one saying occurs in both is not remarkable, and various other explanations are possible; for example, both may have drawn from an earlier work.

(4) He emphasizes the Lucan coloring in both documents; there is, however, good reason to question this (as regards the Gospel) in several important cases.⁶

(5) Surely such a work as he posits would imply in its title what it was, whereas the prologue here — however it be reconstructed — provides a different opening altogether.

(6) Further, if, as appears almost certain, there is any kind of mention in the prologue of the Ten and Thomas (in reference presumably to John 20, 26), or of any other disciple and Thomas, or of Thomas alone, surely the identification with the Gospel according to the *Twelve* must fall to the ground.

(7) He objects that the reference to John 20, 26 cannot be intended to suggest the occasion of the teaching, but his argument is not convincing. "Who would represent the disciples as asking for instruction," he says, "as to prayer, fasting, and the like ⁷ in the period between the Resurrection and the Ascension?" One may answer by asking, Why not? It appears to me quite a possible setting for such a conversation.

(8) He therefore regards this reference as merely the citation of proof that he who uttered these sayings was the living Lord. Surely this would be a most awkward and unusual introduction to such a book.

⁵ See M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 1.

⁶ See *Expository Times*, XXXIX, pp. 492, 494.

⁷ No. 654.5.

(9) There is more to be said, as we shall see, than he allows for the gospel character (in distinction from that of a collection of sayings) at least of OP 654.

His work appears to me, therefore, of greater value for the mass of material he gathers in annotation of the sayings than for any contribution it makes to the solution of the problem of their origin.

Evelyn White controverted at some length the views of Vernon Bartlet,⁸ who later developed them more fully in the *Expositor* (February 1922). In Bartlet's opinion, OP 1 and 654 are not parts of a collection of sayings but actual fragments of a gospel, and he regards 655 as a further fragment. His initial step towards this theory was taken, we may surmise, in view of the sequence of thought which he felt was traceable in the first few sayings of 654 and in the prologue there, which, he holds, clearly indicates post-resurrection teaching on a specific occasion. Bartlet therefore considers that all three fragments comprise "re-statement of the evangelic teaching in terms more suited to later Christian experience than were those of the Synoptic Gospels," believing that this alone adequately explains "the two-fold character of the collection as partly historical, partly timeless or mystical." Further, he holds that the remarkable phenomenon of the evangelic matter in 2 Clement is best explained in the same way and that the gospel-source used by that writer was probably the work from which the OP fragments come; other traces of it he finds in certain scattered *agrapha*, principally those known to Clement of Alexandria. He arranges the whole of these passages in a tentative reconstruction of this source, which he thinks was the Alexandrine Gospel of the Twelve or Greek Gospel according to the Hebrews: he distinguishes the latter from the Aramaic gospel of the same name, although believing that it may have been based upon it in part.

I cannot accept this theory as it stands, but there are points at which it seems nearer to the truth than is that of Evelyn White — in regard to the prologue, for example. There are

⁸ *Contemporary Review*, 1905, pp. 116 f.; *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, I, p. 16.

difficulties however, that he hardly seems to have faced. The sixth objection raised above applies equally here; how could a work that started by referring to an occasion in the gospels where the Ten and Thomas are specifically mentioned be called the Gospel according to the *Twelve*? Again, as argued on an earlier occasion,⁹ it is not easy to accept the distinction between two Gospels according to the Hebrews; there is also reason to question his stress on "interpretative paraphrase" or "re-statement," though of course some variants of familiar texts are due to this cause; and further, it may be doubted whether an early writer like the author of 2 Clement would quote the words of Christ solely from such a post-resurrection gospel, especially as he appears to assume his readers' acquaintance with the sayings.

But another consideration also calls for hesitancy before accepting either of these two most recent theories of the origin of the papyrus sayings, and indeed in my opinion demands a suspension of judgment upon this question until further discovery yields fuller knowledge. There has been too great readiness to believe on insufficient data that the two fragments OP 1 and 654 are from the same work. An unconscious prejudice in favor of this view is natural, and the view may yet prove to be correct, but the facts are not conclusive, and have very commonly not been fully considered. In introducing the second fragment, GH said: "the five sayings . . . begin like those in [1] with the plain formula 'Jesus saith'"; similarly Evelyn White speaks of "the regularly repeated λέγει Ἰησοῦς of 654 and 1." But the facts are that while this phrase occurs five times in OP 1 (the other two or three sayings being mutilated at this point), in 654 it occurs with certainty twice only for the five sayings, and in one of these cases comes at the end of a question presumably put by the disciples in a way quite unlike the regular formula of 1. (Evelyn White is misleading here, since he prints the words at the head of 654. 1, 3 in each case without the square brackets which he uses elsewhere to indicate restorations of the text.) There is, however, a possibility that the formula occurs once more — at the head of 654. 2; the letters remaining are λέγει

⁹ Expository Times, XXXIX, pp. 438, 439.

'I. . . , and all editors have assumed this to be the usual phrase, with the exception of Evelyn White, who for certain reasons suggests that a question was here put into the mouth of Judas (cf. John 14, 22), and that λέγει 'Ιούδας is the correct reading, λέγει 'Ιησοῦς being supplied in a lacuna further down. There is a good deal to be said for his argument, but if it is sound, the occurrence of this phrase twice in response to questions by the disciples and only once otherwise surely means that there is more to be said for the gospel character of 654 than he allows. If his view is rejected, and the regular formula supplied here, we still have in 654 but three cases of it out of five sayings, and in one of the three it does not come at the beginning of the passage, as it always does when it occurs in OP 1.

Further, in combating the idea that in 654 we may have a gospel fragment rather than a collection of sayings, Evelyn White says: "These sayings are carefully marked off from one another not only by the introductory formula λέγει 'Ιησοῦς but also by the orthographic coronis and paragraphus." The second part of this statement is an exaggeration like the first; twice only does the coronis occur regularly — after the prologue and after the first saying. Its only other appearances are after λέγει 'Ιησοῦς at the head of 654.4 and after the (disciples') question in 654.5 The paragraphus appears to be more systematically introduced.

Now these points appear at least to raise a doubt as to whether we really have here two fragments of the same work. It seems probable to me that in OP 1 we have part of a genuine Treasury of Sayings gathered from the canonical gospels and elsewhere (not excluding oral tradition) and probably made for private use; the codex form — of which this is a single page — was clearly more suitable for this purpose than the roll, since it could be searched through quickly for what was wanted. There is no proof that it was a public document, the few literary traces, if they may be so called, such as the uncial script and the use of biblical abbreviations only, being quite proper to such a devotional manual; nor is the homogeneity, of which Evelyn White makes much, other than what might be expected if the sayings all come from one Master Mind. On the other hand,

OP 654 has much more the appearance of being part of a secondary gospel (of which OP 655 may well be another fragment), the roll form and the fact that it includes conversations both pointing in this direction. The reference in the prologue to 'words' does not rule this out, as Evelyn White suggests, for unlike the more general gospels of the ministry it evidently dealt with post-resurrection conversations between Jesus and his disciples; many later works of this sort are extant, and this one may well have been the most primitive attempt to amplify the gospels at this point.

Turning now to the question of the possible authenticity of the new material found in these fragments, we may surely say first of all that it is entirely possible that genuine memorabilia should find their way into such a thesaurus as I have suggested that OP 1 represents; this might happen in innumerable ways. It appears to me distinctly less probable that a post-resurrection gospel would incorporate trustworthy additional matter, but I cannot rule out the possibility. For one thing, a similar but later work, the *Death of Joseph*, commences with a body of teaching clearly framed to give a gospel sound to a work that presently degenerates into futility, and it includes several passages that have been thought possibly genuine. In the present instance the fact that the opening saying seems to have been drawn from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which on many grounds is held to have preserved some reliable traditions, encourages the idea that we may have here some elements of value. In the prologue to OP 654 the writer seems to have had in mind not only John 20, 26-29 but also the two following verses. It is as though he had said: 'Here are some of those other things for which the evangelist had no room; they also will help you to live and not taste of death.' But whether the pious purpose was actually fulfilled is of course another question.

It may be asked how far these passages accord with the mind of Christ as known to us from the canonical gospels? Many different answers will be given to that question. We have already had before us the rather disparaging estimate formed of them by Evelyn White and Vernon Bartlet; differing considerably on critical points they are agreed here in accepting with

modifications Sanday's view that the sayings originated under the conditions of thought created by the canonical gospels, and that little value can be attached to the new material.¹⁰ In contrast, two other opinions may be cited regarding the sayings as a whole. Of those in OP 1, J. H. Moulton said: "That he really uttered the sayings ascribed to him in this fragment I cannot doubt for a moment. They are all in complete accord with his teaching, and they have just that vivid, brief, pictorial, parabolic style which no one could ever imitate, and which we must instinctively recognize as coming to us from the lips of him who spake as never man spake."¹¹ And Moulton welcomed OP 654 and 655 with almost equal cordiality.¹² A more reasoned estimate is given by H. T. Andrews: "There seems to be no motive sufficient to explain the additions that have been made to the text of the Gospels. It cannot be proved that the expansions have been made in the interests of any sect or heresy. Unless new discoveries provide the clue, or some reasonable explanation can otherwise be found, there seems to be no reason why we should not regard the sayings as containing material which ought to be taken into account in the critical study of the teaching of Jesus."¹³

It is not possible to deal here in full detail with the individual sayings, but the following points may be especially noticed.

(1) OP 1. 2: "*Except ye fast toward the world, ye shall not find the kingdom; and unless ye sanctify the whole week, ye shall not see the Father.*"

This is Evelyn White's rendering, his reasons for which are, I think, sound; he quotes Taylor^{13a} to the effect that "in no case does 'to sabbatize a sabbath' mean to keep the sabbath in the ordinary sense," and, rejecting the idea that reference is being made either to the sabbatical year or to the day of atonement, he suggests that there is plenty of evidence for the use of *σάββατον* for 'week' (see Luke 18, 12; 1 Cor. 16, 2, etc.). He does not

¹⁰ W. Lock and W. Sanday, *Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus*, 1897, p. 41.

¹¹ *A Neglected Sacrament*, p. 81.

¹² *Ibid.* pp. 62 f.

¹³ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, XVI, p. 879.

^{13a} *The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels*, p. 14.

seem very sure whether to think the saying a genuine utterance of Jesus or a product of early Christian reflection. On the one hand, it may have been "uttered on some such occasion as that to which the group of incidents recorded in Luke 5, 33-6, 11 belong"; on the other, he links it with Matt. 5, 20 and conjectures that it "was developed in the atmosphere of later thought from this passage with the aid of particulars borrowed from the Lucan passage noticed just above." This latter suggestion seems questionable in view of the familiar passage in Justin,¹⁴ beginning "The new law wishes you to sabbatize continually," and similar teaching in other fathers.

(2) OP 1.3: "*I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart.*"

The diversity of opinion about this saying, and especially about the remarkable phrase with which it starts, may be illustrated by the fact that Sanday considers it a product of later theology — it "is unlike the language which our Lord himself used while among men," while in the same pamphlet his colleague Lock thought that although later thought had probably somewhat modified an original saying, it was "conceivable that in the intimate circle of his followers he should have used some such sad utterance as this."¹⁵ Surely the past tenses are not unlikely for one looking back in passionate sorrow upon the efforts that were soon to end; in Mark 12, 6-8 Jesus even speaks in parable of the immediate future as though it were a matter of history. Nor can we say with confidence what strange high claims he may not have made, unless we are prepared to rule out many Synoptic passages (Matt. 23, 37, etc.) as well as most of John. Evelyn White regards the saying as the work of a "compiler" and finds in it several "literary debts" both to the gospels and the Old Testament; but it is equally open to us to suppose that Jesus himself framed this fuller expression of teaching he had previously given and also that he borrowed and adopted phrases from the older writings, as he frequently did. One passage is of special interest (Baruch 3, 37), for GH

¹⁴ Dialogue, 12.

¹⁵ Lock and Sanday, pp. 36, 22.

point out that this was applied by several early fathers to Christ's sojourn upon earth; but may not the explanation of their use be that he himself had so employed it?

(3) OP 1.5: "*Wherever there are two, they are not without God, and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood and there am I.*"

The first part of this is not quite certain, but the reconstruction here followed is now very generally accepted; if it is correct, we have further evidence to link with that of Clement of Alexandria¹⁶ and Ephrem Syrus¹⁷ that a parallel to Matt. 18, 20 was extant in which the divine presence with a single individual was affirmed. Many explanations of the second part have been given, of which Harnack's (quoted and endorsed by Evelyn White, p. 39) seems the best — that it refers to, or at least makes use of, Eccles. 10, 9 and "is a protest against the idea that the presence of God is only to be obtained by fasting, prayer, and meditation. . . . God is also present in the daily task." Moulton aptly carries the connection with Ecclesiastes a stage farther, and suggests that the meaning is that the perils inseparable from toil are to be encountered fearlessly in the assurance that He is there.¹⁸

(4) OP 1.6: "*A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him.*"

This variant of a familiar saying, found in each of the gospels, is closer to Luke 4, 24 than to the others; Evelyn White regards it as a deliberate expansion of that text, and Luke's whole story as an unhistorical manipulation of Mark's account. It is true that the reference in the preceding verse to things done in Capernaum shows that the incident is out of place in Luke, and therefore in all probability correctly placed by Mark and Matthew later in the ministry. But that does not invalidate the narrative as a whole, and the theory of a double elaboration seems unnecessarily complex and the suggested process purposeless. Rendel Harris¹⁹ argues in favor of Luke's narrative as a trustworthy account of a real event, and uses this papyrus saying to support his view. He calls attention to the discon-

¹⁶ Strom. iii. 10.

¹⁸ A Neglected Sacrament, p. 81.

¹⁷ See Moesinger, p. 165.

¹⁹ Expositor, June 1922.

tinuity in the speech of Jesus ("it jumps from an unsuccessful physician to an unappreciated prophet"), and thinks that in the original and correct report of what Jesus said both parts of this saying appeared as here but that Luke omitted the second on professional grounds just as he left out Mark's depreciatory reference to the doctors (5, 26). This is an attractive hypothesis, which at least has the merit of explaining the abrupt transition in Luke's narrative.

(5) OP 654. 1: "*Let not him who seeks cease until he finds, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reign, and having reigned he shall rest.*"

The facts that (as already mentioned) this saying is also found in Clement of Alexandria, and that it is there quoted as from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, are important as showing its currency in early days — whether this document drew it from there, or vice versa, or whether both found it elsewhere. Evelyn White cites also a number of other patristic and apocryphal references, and this is important evidence that we have here a real compilation and not merely irresponsible imagination. I have expounded the saying rather fully elsewhere,²⁰ and cannot now do more than underline the suggestion that we have here a much needed basis in the words of Jesus for the apostolic teaching of 'reigning with Him' (Rom. 5, 17; 2 Tim. 2, 12; Rev. 5, 10, etc.). Evelyn White neglects this part of the saying; the translation of GH, 'reach the kingdom,' is unfortunate.

(6) OP 655. 1: "... *having one garment, what do ye lack? . . . He himself will give you your garment.*"

If correctly restored, these words (the context of which is parallel to Matt. 6, 25–28) give a useful emphasis on simplicity; they remind us of the prohibition against 'two coats' on a particular occasion (Matt. 10, 10), and of the more general precept in 1 Tim. 6, 6–8. But the passage with closest resemblance is one in the Clementine Homilies, xv. 7, which may well rest upon this saying: "Those who have determined to accept the blessings of the future reign have no right to regard as their own the things that are here, since they belong to a foreign king,

²⁰ The Unwritten Gospel, p. 48.

with the exception only of water and bread and those things procured with sweat to maintain life, and also one garment, for they are not permitted to go naked on account of the all-seeing Heaven."

(7) OP 655. 2: "*His disciples say unto him, When wilt thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see thee? He saith, When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed.*"

I am not at all convinced that this and the two passages from 2 Clement and Clement of Alexandria commonly referred to in connection with it are variant accounts of one incident. This is the usual view, GH stating that the discovery of this fragment makes this saying one of the best attested agrapha. But in view of the fact that in each case the questions, the questioners, and the replies are all different, and remembering that curiosity about these matters is entirely what we should expect, we may surely be permitted to doubt this statement. Further, while the words in Clement of Alexandria, probably cited from the Gospel according to the Egyptians, "When ye trample upon the garment of shame," may be (as is commonly thought) a mystical reference to Gen. 3, 7 and imply the encratite teaching that the kingdom would not come until man returned to the state of innocence, a much simpler explanation of the Oxyrhynchus passage is possible and attractive. When they were stripped and martyred, "despising the shame," vision of Him was theirs (cf. Acts 7, 56). Incidentally, this interpretation accords well with the only passage in the gospels where Jesus warns against being "ashamed" (Mark 8, 38).

II

Leaving now these three earliest documents unearthed by GH, we come to the consideration of the very interesting and important fragment OP 840. A clash of opinion has taken place regarding this; for myself, while I do not think that all the difficulties about it have been answered, I am disposed to regard it as incorporating early and valuable material. GH considered the papyrus to have been written in the fourth century, but the gospel of which it preserves an extract to have been composed probably in the second century. Their view

was that the story of a discussion between Jesus and a priest in the temple which occupies the greater part of the fragment cannot be genuine and is probably merely an apocryphal elaboration of Matt. 15, 1-20 and Mark 7, 1-23. Their reason for this conclusion (with which Schürer agreed) was the extent of "the divergences between this account and the extant and no doubt well informed authorities with regard to the topography and ritual of the Temple." Most of these were, however, taken up and dealt with at length by Büchler,²¹ who argued that "the writer was accurately informed on all these matters and that tradition fully confirms the details which sound so incredible." Several replies were made to Büchler—including one by Schürer²²—and some arguments more favorable to the fragment were also adduced.²³ Swete took a non-committal view, saying, "The controversy cannot be said to have reached a settlement."²⁴ Since this discussion in 1908, soon after the publication of the fragment, little notice has been given to it; Marmorstein, however, in 1914, adduced fresh evidence and argument in support of Büchler and concluded an article upon the question with the words, "It is difficult to doubt the genuineness of the fragment after what has been said."²⁵ Burkitt, however, considers it "more likely to represent the ideas of some Egyptian Christians of the second or third century than to be based upon what Jesus really said in Palestine in the first century."²⁶ And Wessely disposes of it summarily with the remark, "The whole passage is apocryphal and owes its origin to the imagination of the author; all the details with which he has embellished his narrative are suspect."²⁷

Without dealing fully with all the points raised, the following certainly require notice.

(1) The scene is laid in a place of purification (ἀγνευτήριον), and it is not clear what is meant. It cannot refer to the court of

²¹ Jewish Quarterly Review, January 1908.

²² Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1908, col. 170.

²³ Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1908, pp. 175, 204.

²⁴ Lietzmann's Kleine Texte 31; also English translation, 1908.

²⁵ Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1914, p. 336.

²⁶ The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, 2nd ed., 1921, p. 21.

²⁷ Patrologia Orientalis, XVIII, p. 3.

the priests, for then the complaint would have been that Jesus was there at all, since it could only be entered by laymen for the purpose of sacrifice; on the other hand, neither the name, the demand of the priest, nor the presence of the "holy vessels" appears applicable to the court of the Israelites. GH and Swete therefore think that a confusion has arisen and that the author thus betrays his ignorance of the temple. Büchler maintains that the reference is probably to a wall-chamber opening out of the court of the Israelites, and urges that the objection that the context suggests a large open space (*περιεπάτει ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*) is not fatal, for if Jesus were walking to and fro before the door of such a room the situation depicted might easily arise.

(2) If by the "holy vessels" is meant (as we should expect) the table of shewbread and other objects within the Holy Place, an error may be suspected here also, since these were invisible from either of the two courts; if the reference is merely to the bronze laver and neighboring objects (as GH suggest), it is strange to find emphasis laid on the sight of them, since they were always visible to those in the court of the Israelites. But Büchler's idea is that such a chamber as he has suggested would be the natural place to which the table and other objects would be taken from the Holy Place to be washed, and he adduces evidence that this was done on the day after a festival. Swete's objection, that "there is nothing to indicate that the occasion was a special one," seems inadequate, for the earlier narrative may well have included such a statement.

(3) Büchler admits that the only known chambers of the sort suggested were the two intended for the high-priest, and remarks: "There may have been others, and these two may have been used on other occasions, but no details have come down to us concerning them." Schürer ridiculed this argument. Certainly the absence of any such information tells against the passage, though of course it is true that our knowledge of these matters is necessarily incomplete. Similarly, we have no knowledge of the "pool of David" referred to here or of the two staircases apparently connected with it.

(4) As regards the implied suggestion that Jews had to wash and change their garments before entering the temple, GH and

Schürer are of opinion that the writer has by mistake referred to laymen regulations applicable only to priests. But on both points Büchler brings forward evidence, which Swete accepts, against Schürer's view that the principal passage (Josephus, *Jewish War*, v. 5, 6) refers merely to cleansing after levitical contamination had occurred. I do not think Büchler's attempt to show that immersion was required is successful, nor that white linen was necessary; nor again does the distinction he draws between Jesus and the disciples upon these points seem sound, nor is the suggested reason for it acceptable.

(5) An important point emerges here, which has been generally ignored. Surely the form of the priest's rebuke implies that it was not a question of the violation of any legal regulations but simply of failure to follow custom and tradition. If the law had really been violated, would not the temple police have been summoned? In view of such passages as Gen. 35, 2 and Ex. 19, 10, and the traditional strictness about washing continually referred to in the gospels (see especially Mark 7, 3f, and Swete's notes thereon), it is difficult to think Schürer's position sound. If in the provinces a man should have been looked at askance if after marketing he used a purchased article without ceremonially purifying himself and it, surely it is not unlikely that in the temple itself it would be permissible to enter only with clean feet and clothes. That a measure of ambiguity attaches to the written regulations dealing with this matter is therefore not of great importance.

(6) It may be thought strange that if such a clash as this occurred it is not recorded in the gospels, but the explanation may well be that the occasion was one of those unmentioned visits of which there is sufficient evidence, though no real record, in the gospels. This accords well with Büchler's idea about the cleansing of the vessels on the day after a festival. We may remark that there is no room in the gospels for such a skirmish during the last visit, since conflict arose there immediately on bigger issues.

(7) Lastly, Büchler seems to me to be right when he urges that the reference to the defilement of the water is apt and sensible, for it was running water and however pure it might

look it had "on its long road to the temple received many undesirable defilements." Surely GH are lacking in insight when they suggest that the writer had in mind the stagnant pools of Egyptian villages, and that we cannot think of priests as washing in such a place. The reminder of the filth with which the water had previously been in contact is a subtle way of suggesting the uselessness of skin-deep purification, and it is reinforced with biting irony (reminiscent of, though entirely distinct from, Matt. 23) by the reference to the care bestowed upon the skin by harlots.

Though there are several real difficulties, I do not consider that a complete case has been made out against the authenticity of the passage. Several positive arguments may be briefly added in its favor. The accuracy of the fragment in several odd details tends to arouse one's faith in it; the combination of priest and pharisee, though unusual, was not impossible, and, as GH say, "such a person is particularly appropriate as the champion of external purity"; the reference to the white garments of the priest is correct; and there is a parallel to the mention of 'flute-girls' in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Further, as Swete remarks, it "is free from the false rhetoric and the fables of the later romances, nor does it shew any trace of a docetic or Gnostic tendency"; GH and Moffatt agree in this estimate, the latter also calling attention to the remarkable fact that it provides material regarding the Jerusalem ministry of Jesus — and is unlike other apocryphal gospels in this respect.²⁸ Again, if Swete is right in assigning it to the "quarter of a century that followed the close of the Apostolic age," it is surely not easy to think that a tradition dating so near to the time of the Apostles can be wholly destitute of historical truth. We should remember, too, that we have no other example of a story of this length and force and character which comes to us from so early a period. Elaborated and embellished it may be, and no doubt inaccurate in some details, but that it narrates a real incident appears to me distinctly possible, and to regard it as merely a development of the canonical passages quoted by GH, or as entirely imaginative, certainly does not seem an adequate explanation.

²⁸ Hastings, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, I, p. 499.

Omitting Christ's brief interrogation to the priest, "Art thou, then, being here in the temple, clean?" the fragment yields us the two following agrapha, of which the first belongs to a different incident than the one we have been considering here.

1. ". . . before doing wrong, he makes all manner of subtle excuse. But give heed lest ye also suffer the same things as they; for the evil-doers among men receive their reward not among the living only, but also await punishment and much torment."

2. "Woe ye blind, who see not. Thou hast washed in these running waters wherein dogs and swine have been cast night and day, and thou hast cleansed and wiped the outside skin which also harlots and flute-girls anoint and wash and wipe and beautify for the lust of men, but within they are full of scorpions and all wickedness. But I and my disciples, who thou sayest have not bathed, have been dipped in the waters of eternal life which come from [God]."

Both these passages are included by Taylor Smith in his list of agrapha,²⁹ and the last sentence of the second is also quoted by W. E. Barnes in his very brief list;³⁰ there is of course no reason for thinking it genuine if the rest of the narrative is not.

III

We now come to the last of the Oxyrhynchus fragments to be considered here, that published by GH in 1914 and numbered 1224, for an earlier one, numbered 1081, published in 1911, seems quite clearly Gnostic and unhistorical.³¹ Unfortunately there is very little to work upon in studying 1224, for the papyrus is much mutilated and a few lines at the top of four columns (two on each side of the fragment) are all that remain. In the opinion of GH the codex to which this belonged was written in the fourth century; the work itself may have been much earlier, of course; they think enough has been preserved to show that the work was not a collection of sayings but an uncanonical gospel, and not, so far as can be seen, one of those at present known to us. Their restorations are admittedly highly conjectural, but on the basis of them the following translation is given:

²⁹ Article 'Agrapha,' in International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia.

³⁰ W. E. Barnes, *A Companion to Bible Studies*, Cambridge, p. 33.

³¹ See Moffatt in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, I, p. 499.

1. "overcame me. And Jesus stood by in a vision and said, Why art thou cast down? For it is not thou who . . . but he who gave . . ."

2. "thou didst say . . . making no answer. What then hast thou forbidden? What is the new doctrine that they say thou teachest or what the new baptism that thou dost preach?"

3. "The scribes and pharisees and priests seeing him had indignation because he reclined in the midst of sinners. And Jesus hearing them said, They that are whole need not a physician."

4. "... pray for your enemies. For he that is not against you is with you, and he that to-day is afar off shall to-morrow be near you . . . adversary."

In view of the opening words, Vernon Bartlet suggested that we have here part of the Gospel of Peter, the extant fragment of which shows that it was written as though narrated by that Apostle.³² If this is so, then Fragment 1 may refer either to the call of Peter, the transfiguration, the walking on the sea, or some unrecorded occurrence, and the whole fragment may belong to the Galilean ministry; there are difficulties, however, especially "making no answer" and "they say" in Fragment 2, which it is not easy to fit into such a reconstruction. An alternative proposal is that the order of the columns is rather thus, 2-3-4-1, a possible arrangement against which, however, GH advance good arguments; if it were correct, Fragment 1 would then possibly refer to Peter's fall. But apart from the above mentioned difficulty regarding Fragment 2, which is equally valid on this hypothesis, what we know of the Gospel of Peter makes it impossible that the Galilean teaching should be on one side of a page and Peter's restoration after his denial on the other. There is also the serious objection to any form of the Petrine hypothesis that Jesus is always named *ὁ κύριος* in the long extent extract from the Gospel according to Peter.

I would tentatively suggest quite a different idea. There is a third possible order of the columns; namely 3-4-1-2, on one assumption, however, — that GH have misread the numeral at the head of Fragment 4, and that it is really $[\rho]o\beta$ instead of their $[\rho]os$. If that be so, it may be James's story and not

³² Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part X, p. 4.

Peter's that we are tapping here. Fragments 3 and 4 will be parts of a brief summary of what James heard or saw in the Galilean days when he was in antagonism to his brother who was acting so strangely (Mark 3, 21. 31), leading up to a statement of how on the cross Jesus did actually pray as he had taught, in consequence of which James's famous vow ³³ was made. Fragment 1 will be an alternative account of the vision of which the Gospel according to the Hebrews tells us, and Fragment 4 part of the conversation that resulted. I am not prepared to defend this hypothesis *contra mundum*, but it at least has the merit of explaining Fragment 2, which as reconstructed is the most perplexing part of the whole. The divergence between Fragment 1 and the Gospel according to the Hebrews cannot be pressed, for the closing sentences of Fragment 1 are exceedingly doubtful. The high page-number (174 above col. 2) is a difficulty, but not more so on this arrangement than on the others; it is best explained by the supposition that several documents were written in one book.

As to whether we may think that this fragment is in any measure historical, the presence of the priests is certainly a ground of suspicion, for in the nature of things they do not appear on the scene in Galilee; it would of course be just possible that a parallel incident in Jerusalem was here narrated. But even if we are dealing with fiction, the quoting of genuine utterances is not altogether excluded, and as we find one such in Fragment 3, it is not unlikely that Fragment 4 also may be relied upon. If so, we have a very fresh and forceful variant of familiar teaching, which may even lie at the base of Eph. 2, 13, and if the lacuna be filled up thus — 'and ye shall not have,' we are at once reminded of the similar passage in the Didache. It may be remarked that Barnes includes this passage in his short list of *agrapha*.

³³ See Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, V, p. 342.

THE IMMORALITIES OF THE PATRIARCHS ACCORDING TO THE EXEGESIS OF THE LATE MIDDLE AGES AND OF THE REFORMATION

ROLAND H. BAINTON

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE Old Testament has always been something of an embarrassment to the Christian church. The book was Scripture and its heroes were to be taken as examples. Nevertheless there was much in their conduct which ran counter to the prevailing Christian ethics. A problem thus arose both in exegesis and in ethics. Were the patriarchs to be justified? Should they be imitated? Marcion evaded the difficulty by simply rejecting the Old Testament, pointing out the complete antithesis, for example, between the precept, "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath," and the conduct of Joshua, who kept the sun up till his wrath went down.¹ In the main the fathers resolved such difficulties by allegory, but even this key did not suffice. There was no denying that Moses really slew the Egyptian, that the Israelites robbed them, that Abraham lied, that Jacob was polygamous, and that Samson committed suicide, not to mention the deeds which made it appropriate to attribute to David the penitential psalms. Origen, the prince of allegorists, admitted that the incest of Lot and the polygamy of Abraham and Jacob were "mysteries not understood by us."²

The Middle Ages and the Reformation had four solutions for the problem. (1) The first was that the heroes of the old covenant had a special command, or revelation, from God, which is not repeated in our day. (2) Some thought, however, that these revelations might recur. (3) Others, who could not pretend to revelations but were interested in the revival of some features of the Old Testament morality, justified both the patriarchs and themselves on the basis of natural law, of the law

¹ Harnack, *Marcion* (Texte und Untersuchungen 45), p. 105.

² *De Principiis*, iv. 9. Migne, P. G. XI, 360.

of necessity, and of Aristotelian ἐπιείκεια. (4) The fourth solution was to seek an escape by way of definition. The patriarchs did not really lie, nor kill, nor steal.

The first position was the most common, that the patriarchs had a special command, or revelation, from God granting a dispensation from the commandments. Bernard of Clairvaux said:

That which is promulgated from on high can by no means be changed save by God who gave it. The commands, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, and the rest, admit of no human dispensation. . . . But God can relax what he will and when he will, as when he permitted the Israelites to despoil the Egyptians or the prophet to join himself to a harlot, etc.³

It will be observed that the dispensation which Bernard allowed was only for the second table of the decalogue. This restriction was definitely stated by Bonaventura, who distinguished that which is only relatively evil, *malum in se*, from that which is intrinsically evil, *malum secundum se*. Offences against the first table are intrinsically evil, those against the second table are only relatively so.⁴

Scotus provided the theoretical basis for the distinction, when he said that although God is absolute, and right is right because he wills it, nevertheless he can do nothing illogical and self-contradictory, as would be the case were he to permit himself to be hated by man. For that reason there can be no dispensation from the first table, which enjoins duties to God, but only from the second, which has reference to man. This God did relax; for example, in neglect of the fifth commandment he ordered Abraham to kill his innocent son Isaac, of the sixth he commanded Hosea to unite himself with other women, of the seventh God permitted the Israelites in Egypt to take to themselves gold and silver vessels and clothes, and this was also an offence against the eighth commandment, because the goods were taken on the pretext of a loan.⁵

Occam abandoned the Scotist restrictions and declared that

³ Migne, P. L. 182, cf. note 95 in Migne, 864,

⁴ E. Pluzanski, *Essai sur la Philosophie de Duns Scot*, 1888, p. 272.

⁵ J. Klein, *Der Gottesbegriff des Johannes Duns Skotus*, 1913, pp. 161 ff.

God could grant a dispensation not merely for theft and adultery, but even for hate against himself.⁶

For the second position, that special commands may recur, one would naturally look in the Middle Ages to the Spiritual Franciscans, for whom the rule of Saint Francis was itself a divine revelation, and who had revelations of their own;⁷ but that they appealed to these divine communications to rehabilitate patriarchal morality does not seem likely in spite of the vile stories circulated by their opponents.⁸ Dolcino, to be sure, taught that one might lie and break an oath to the Inquisition, but whether he grounded this liberty on a special inspiration I do not know. In the Middle Ages I have not been able to discover a single clear illustration of this second position.

The third view, that the conduct of the patriarchs was in accord with the law of nature, the law of necessity, Aristotle's *ἐπιείκεια*, is adumbrated by John of Salisbury, who justified tyrannic de by an appeal to the examples of Ehud, Jael, and Judith. Not a word was said about a special revelation.⁹ Occam stated the position more clearly when he said that by reason of utility and necessity one may act counter to the words and deeds of Christ, provided one does not do violence to His intent. If one does not know Christ's intent a revelation is necessary. (This is the first solution which we mentioned above.) But there are many cases in which Christians may judge of the intent of Christ without a revelation. Christ told the disciples to resist not evil, but Paul called the high priest a whited sepulchre. Christ told the disciples not to take two cloaks, nor shoes, yet in manifest necessity they might do otherwise, fulfilling the mind though not the words of Christ.¹⁰ Lying is legit mate if one has the proper intent. Jehu was justified in deceiving the priests of Baal, and David in misleading Abimelech.¹¹ As ground for the transgression of the code Oc-

⁶ Pluzanski, p. 268 note 3.

⁷ H. C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, III, pp. 30, 79, 87, and 110.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 83, 97, 113.

⁹ Polycraticus viii, xx; Migne, P. L. 199, 794.

¹⁰ *Dialogus*, ed. 1494, pars 3, lib. ii, tract. i, cap. xxii-xxiv, fol. cci and verso.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pars 1, lib. vii, cap. iv, fol. cxv.

cam appealed to natural law and to Aristotle's *ἐπιείκεια*.¹² This same doctrine was employed by the conciliarists, who, in order to end the schism, desired, in defiance of canon law, to give to a general council authority to depose and to make popes on the principle that necessity knows no law. Did not the Maccabees, when they fought on the sabbath, transgress the divine law? ¹³

The fourth solution was by way of definition. The Lombard said that just as killing is homicide only when practised by the private citizen and not in the case of the magistrate, who executes the law, so the despoiling of the Egyptians was not theft for those who acted in accord with the divine command, but only for those who were moved by cupidity.¹⁴ Thomas Aquinas, armed with this exegetical device, declared that there had been no dispensation from either table of the law. The sacrifice of Isaac was not homicide and the despoiling of the Egyptians was not theft, because these acts were in accord with the divine command. Judith did not really lie to Holofernes; her words were true according to a certain mystical sense.¹⁵ This solution is to all intents and purposes the same as the first if the character of the act is regarded as altered solely by reason of the divine command. What is that but a dispensation based on a special command? If, however, appeal is made to extenuating circumstances, we have practically the solution by way of the law of nature and necessity.

In the period of the Reformation all these positions recur. The most common is the first.

Luther took in the main the view that the patriarchs had a special inspiration which is not repeated in our day. The following passages illustrate the point.

¹² Ibid., lib. vi, cap. c, fol. cx verso.

¹³ So Heinrich von Langenstein, cited by Friedrich Kropatscheck, *Das Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche*, vol. I, *Die Vorgeschichte, Das Erbe des Mittelalters*, Leipzig, 1904, p. 386 note 3. See also Karl Wenck, 'Konrad v. Gelnhausen und die Quellen der konziliaren Theorie,' *Historische Zeitschrift*, 76, 1896, pp. 44 f. He contends that the conciliarists took the doctrine of the *ἐπιείκεια* not from Occam but from Thomas. Cf. J. B. Schwab, *Johannes Gerson*, 1858, index under *Epikie*.

¹⁴ Migne, P. L. 192, 832.

¹⁵ Pluzanski, p. 276; cf. Klein, pp. 161-162.

If any one wishes to imitate Noah [wrote Luther] and get drunk, he deserves to go to hell. So Paul swore, but it is not permitted to me.¹⁶

Samson was called upon by God to plague the Philistines so as to save the children of Israel. . . . But no one will follow this example, be he a true Christian and full of the Spirit. . . . First you must be like Samson; then you may do as Samson.¹⁷

The Spirit can and does produce works which seem to be contrary to all of God's commands, but they are only against the commands of the second table, which have reference to one's neighbor, and are in accord with the first three commands in the first table, which refer to God. You must first be a Peter, Paul, Jacob, David, and Elias. Then in God's name you may well curse with highest merit before God.¹⁸

As for the fact that the Jews smashed altars and idols, they had in that time a special command of God for that work, which we in this time do not have. As for Abraham sacrificing his son, he had a special command of God for it.¹⁹

From the following passage it would appear that Luther recognized also the force of the law of necessity. He wrote:

Although the patriarchs had many wives, Christians nevertheless should not follow such an example, because *there is no necessity*, nor improvement, nor special word of God which commands the like, and great offense and disturbance might come of it.²⁰

Still again it would seem that Luther did not definitely exclude the possibility of contemporary revelations for the rehabilitation of patriarchal morality. With reference to the bigamy of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Luther wrote:

Ehud and Samson had a special calling and promise of divine help. If the Landgrave had had such a calling and had believed the word of God, then God might have accomplished his purpose through him, even though he were a sinner.²¹

Luther looked to the Holy Spirit for genuine direction in matters of conduct.²² Nevertheless even the earlier Luther was not prepared to dissociate the divine guidance from the written Word, and in the conflict with the radicals he took the position

¹⁶ Weimar ed., XI, 205, 8.

¹⁷ Weimar ed., XI, 261, 16 f.

¹⁸ Erlangen ed., VIII, 42.

¹⁹ Erlangen ed., LIII, 267.

²⁰ Erlangen ed., LIII, 390.

²¹ Weimar ed., Tischreden I, p. 368, Nr. 768. Melancthon, in Enders and Kawerau, IV, 79: *Tunc venient nobis inspirata consilia a Deo, quae nunquam cogitavimus.*

²² Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Luther, p. 234.

that no special word of God could be acknowledged unless corroborated by a miracle. To the peasants he wrote:

If you persist in your undertaking in the teeth of the law of God and of Christ in the Old Testament and in the New, and of the law of nature, then you must produce a new special command from God, corroborated by signs and wonders which give you authority to do this.²³

But when the Anabaptist claimed to produce miracles, Luther raised the requirements.

I won't suffer [he declared] a preacher in office, *even though he works miracles*, unless he is sure that he has the right teaching and Word and a certain office.²⁴

In the main, then, one finds in Luther the Scotist solution.²⁵

Calvin pursued the same method, and repudiated tyrannicide, explaining the examples of Moses and Othniel as due to a "legitimate calling of God," with which they were "armed from heaven."²⁶ Sometimes, however, Calvin adduced extenuating circumstances. For the practice of polygamy Abraham had a special reason which is not valid to-day, in that it was needful for him to raise up seed for the fulfilment of the promise. Similarly, Jacob was justified in using the handmaids at the instance of his wives, but the taking of Rachel is inexcusable, for this was an indulgence of the flesh.²⁷

The second position, that the patriarchal morality may be revived by virtue of special revelations here and now, came very clearly to light among the Anabaptists at Münster. Their leader, Bernhard Rothmann, relates that "we laid off our arms and weapons and prepared us for the slaughter," until God "through a spiritual revelation" showed us that "now is the time of the restitution of all things," and that "we and all true

²³ Weimar ed., XVIII, p. 304; cf. 96-97 and Erlangen ed., LIII, 255.

²⁴ Erlangen ed., XLVIII, 139-140.

²⁵ On Luther's whole position see Karl Müller, 'Luthers Äusserungen über das Recht des bewaffneten Widerstandes gegen den Kaiser,' Sitzungsberichte, Munich Academy, Philos., philol. und hist. Kl., 1915, Abh. 8, p. 8, and Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Luther, p. 227.

²⁶ *Corpus Reformatorum*, Calvini opera, II, Instit. iv, xx, pp. 1115-1116, *legitima Dei vocatio*.

²⁷ Opera, X, pp. 258-259.

Christians in this time may not only ward off the force of the godless with the sword, but also because he has placed the sword in the hands of his people to avenge all unrighteousness.”²⁸

Whether Bernadino Ochino should be classed with this group is open to question. He was banished from Zürich, in the seventy-sixth year of his age, chiefly because of a dialogue on polygamy which concluded with the statement:

But if you do that to which God impels you, provided you are thoroughly convinced that it is a divine prompting, you will not sin.²⁹

Usually Ochino took the Scotist view, and justified Moses' killing of the Egyptian, Samson's suicide, and Rahab's lie on the basis of a divine inspiration.³⁰ Jesus blamed his disciples, not because they desired to call down fire from heaven, but because they asked him whether they might do so, thus betraying their uncertainty and the lack of a special inspiration.³¹ There is a slight divergence from the Scotist view in that Ochino regarded as incapable of dispensation not so much the love of God as the love of one's neighbor. One might indeed steal and kill if it could be done in love.³²

²⁸ Restitution rechter und gesunder christlichen Lehre (Neudruck deutscher Literaturwerke, Nos. 77 and 78), pp. 107 and 110. Rothmann says that they were taught “durch geistlike apenbaringe.”

²⁹ *Dialogi*, xxx, ii, p. 227: Tum si id feceris ad quid te Deus impellet, dummodo diuinum esse instinctum exploratum habeas, non peccabis. I give citations from Ochino and from some of the following authors in the original, because their works are comparatively inaccessible.

³⁰ *Il Catechismo*, Basileae, 1561, pp. 89, 91, and 123.

³¹ The saying is placed in the mouth of Paul IV; *Dialogi*, xxx, ii, p. 395: Si vobis exploratum fuisset, vos, dum ignem de coelo deuocare vultis, Dei spiritu impelli, nihil opus fuisset, vt a me consilium peteretis: sed quia de eo dubitabatis, ideo me interrogastis.

³² *Prediche di Bernadino da Siena*, Basileae, 1563, III, LXXVIII, IIIi7-KKk, Bisogna adonque dire che se ben li precetti della seconda tauola quanto al non robbare, amazzare, & altre opere estrinseche sieno dispensabili, nientedimeno quanto all' atto interno d' amare spiritualmente, et per gloria di Dio li prossimi nostri, il precetto e indispensabile. Tal che se ben possiamo per volonta di Dio tor la robba ai prossimi et anco la vita, non pero possiamo in modo alcuno non amarlo, & non desiderare & procurargli tutte quelle cose che piu gli seruano acio che illustri la gloria di Dio, etc.

One finds also in Ochino a recognition of the law of necessity.

If [he wrote] one is in extreme need, and has exhausted all other just means, and cannot live without stealing, provided he take only that which is necessary for his urgent and imminent necessity, in that case he would not sin, he would not be a robber, he would not deserve punishment, and he would not be obliged to restore, even though later he became rich, and that, because he would not have taken the goods of another, since necessity would have made his own that which he took, provided that he from whom he took was not in a like necessity.³³

Again Ochino sometimes verged on the Marcionite solution which repudiated the Old Testament ethic as contrary to the law of Christ.³⁴

But what rendered Ochino's position particularly dubious was the fact that he was himself no stranger to the leadings of the Spirit. His flight from Italy was due to "the counsel of God and the direction of the Holy Spirit."³⁵ Just as Moses slew the Egyptian and fled in accord with the will of God, so Ochino would not have chosen so many mortifications if God had not moved and governed him.³⁶ Such statements, had they come to the ears of the Zürich authorities, might well have confirmed their misgivings as to the soundness of Ochino's

³³ Il Catechismo, p. 107: Perche se un fusse in estrema necessità, & hauendo tentati gl' altri giusti modi possibili, non potesse uiuere senza robbare, in tal caso, all' hora tollendo solamente quello che per la urgente & imminente necessità, gli fusse necessario, & non piu non peccarebbe, non sarebbe ladro, non douerebbe esser punito, ne sarebbe obligato a restituire, se ben di poi diuentasse ricco: & questo, perche non hauerebbe tolto quel d'altri, poi che la necessità haurebbe fatto, che quel che prese fusse suo: se già quello dal qual prese non fusse prima di lui uenuto in necessità della medesima cosa.

³⁴ Dialogi, xxx, ii, pp. 393-394; Prediche, III, LXXXVIII, KKk verso.

³⁵ Responsio Bernadini Ochini Senensis ad Marcum Brixiensem, 1543, p. 88: Quod Dei consilio & spiritus sancti directioni tribuerim discessum meum, vehementer irascitur. . . . Quod autem Dei spiritus mihi consultor fuerit & dux itineris, conscientia mea fidelis testis est: neque ad eius rei certitudinem novum socratis demonium excitare opus est.

³⁶ P. Piccolomini, 'Due Lettere inedite di Bernadino Ochino,' Arch. d. Soc. Rom. di Stor. Pat., vol. 28, pp. 201-207, Letter II: Moise, a tempo nutrito sotto l'ombra della figliola di Pharaone in amare l'egyptio monstro che in verita non li era figlio . . . fugi di poi . . . fu per volonta di Dio. . . . Diro similmente di me che non harrei possuto scientemente e voluntariamente elegger tante calunnie con tante mie mortificationi appresso il mondo se Dio non mi havessi mosso et governato lui. Piccolomini doubted whether this letter was really addressed to the Venetian senate. The question is settled by this statement in the Responsio ad Marcum Brixiensem B7: Quod Moisi exemplum peccat: scripsi in hunc modum clarissimi Senatui Veneto.

views on polygamy. Nevertheless, in view of his irreproachable conduct it seems to me highly doubtful whether he meant to do more than conserve the common exegetical device for saving the rectitude of the patriarchs.

Among those who laid claim to contemporary revelations one might perhaps include Calvin's 'spiritual libertines,' though their position was not precisely that. Instead of a special revelation those who have crucified the flesh enjoy a perfect and continuous direction of the Spirit. God dwells in them and they become his instruments.³⁷ The homicides of the Old Testament heroes receive justification on the ground that they acted as instruments of God. Sometimes the apologetic takes a slightly different form, namely, that those who are spiritual are bound to tell the truth only among themselves and not to the carnal. Micaiah, even without a direct command, rightly declined to cast the pearls of truth before a swine like Ahab, but told the truth in the presence of the believing Jehoshaphat.³⁸ Samson deceived the Philistines because they were flesh and he was spirit.³⁹ This reminds one of Dolcino's justification of lying and oath-breaking before the Inquisition. Farel was probably not mistaken in regarding this type of exegesis as a covert apology for the evasiveness of the Nicodemites, who, having repudiated the Roman Catholic Church, nevertheless attended mass to avoid persecution.⁴⁰

³⁷ Karl Müller, 'Calvin und die Libertiner,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XL, N. F. III, 1922, pp. 83-129. On p. 112 he gives passages bearing on this point taken from the replies of Calvin and Farel. I have not had access to Farel's work. The following passage is taken from C. Schmidt, *Les Libertins Spirituels, Traités Mystiques écrits dans les Années 1547 à 1549*, Bâle, 1876, pp. 30-31: Il n'y ha plus ne loy ny Euangile qui ayt pouoir sur luy. . . . Il scait prendre le feu sans se brusler et scait entrer en l'eau sans se noyer. . . . Il ne craint deffence ne commandement, sinon ce qui est conforme a celuy de son Dieu. Car il est le filz de Dieu mesme, ayant son Pere habitant et demourant en luy, lequel le rendt fort, puissant et immuable, ne pouant produire ne donner de son coeur et thresor, que ce qui est de Dieu, car Dieu mesme parle par luy.

³⁸ Müller, p. 113 note 1.

³⁹ Schmidt, p. 41: Mais lisez le text, qui dict qu'il ne le faisoit sinon pour les decepuoir, car il estoit esprit et elle chair.

⁴⁰ Müller, p. 113 note 2. It is highly significant that Müller classes together the groups represented in Schmidt and Jaujard and the Libertins Spirituels of Calvin, and that he finds in all a quietistic mysticism of the type of the *Theologia Germania*. Mül-

The third position, the appeal to the law of nature and necessity, reappeared most markedly in the tracts of the Huguenot pamphleteers, who badly needed a justification for armed revolution and tyrannicide. To them Calvin's restriction of the right of tyrannicide to those who had a special revelation was a source of grave embarrassment, because they wished neither to flout the memory of Calvin, nor to cultivate revelations after the manner of the despised Anabaptists. Beza found a very ingenious way of escape when he explained that the Jews were given a special revelation because they were too stupid to see that they might have resisted tyranny without it.^{40a} In the "Dialogue of Archon and Politie" appeal was made to biblical examples such as that of Judith. Archon objected that these were due to a special revelation, to which Politie replied, "Instead of revelations to-day we have extreme necessity."⁴¹ The author of the *Discours Politique* asserted that the justification from natural law for what Ehud and Jehu did is valid to-day.

I ask, [said he] whether for the lack of a special revelation an act would be deemed unjust which was formerly executed by the commandment of God and thereby shown to be just and equitable? I do not think so.⁴²

These writers restricted the right of revolution, however, to the lower magistrates. The private individual was still in need of a special revelation,⁴³ though the author of the *Discours* thought

ler, pp. 119 and 106. This judgment is of the greater interest because Müller did not know that the tracts used by Jaujard in his *Essai sur le Libertins spirituels de Genève d'après de nouveaux documents* (thèse), 1890, are in fact translations from the Dutch of David Joris. Using the notation of Van der Linde's bibliography of David Joris, Jaujard 1 is Joris 21; Jaujard 2, Joris 194; Jaujard 3, Joris 207; Jaujard 4, Joris 216.

^{40a} *Traité du droit des Magistrats sur leurs suiets*, etc. in *Mémoires de l'Estat de France*, ed. by Simon Goulart, II, p. 489b: Et ce que telles delivrances ne sont advenues que par ceux que Dieu a extraordinairement employez, ne sert de rien contre mon opinion: ains monstre seulement la stupidité & fauts de coeur des Israelites, non sans un iuste iugement de Dieu sur eux à cause de leurs iniquitez.

⁴¹ *Mémoires de l'Estat de France*, III, 96b: *Archon*. Mais la pluspart de telles executions, se faisoient par ordonnance des revelations extraordinaires. . . . *Politie*. Nous avons en ce temps-ci au lieu de revelations l'extreme necessité qui nous enseigne.

⁴² *Mémoires de l'Estat de France* III, 294: ie demande si n'y ayant eu particuliere revelation la chose seroit pour cela iniuste, qui a esté autresfois executée par commandement de Dieu, & par la manifestee pour iuste et equitable? Je ne le croy pas.

⁴³ *Mémoires*, etc., II, 491b; III, 105b.

that in case of urgent need the private citizen assumed a public character.⁴⁴

Of the fourth position, the escape by way of definition, there is an example in the statement of Oecolampadius, who said:

I do not think it against the spirit of God and Christ, if the brothers had killed Phinehas at a divine command, for it is not killing which constitutes homicide or fratricide, but it is a mind devoid of love.⁴⁵

Finally one finds a measure of return to the Marcionite position among the advocates of religious liberty, who wished to cut the ground from under Calvin's appeal to the Old Testament. Sebastian Castellio rejected this appeal, partly on the ground that there was a special command in those days, but

the most important reason of all is that we are subject to Christ, whose doctrine and example we ought to follow, whatever others may have said and done, because the Father has told us that this is his beloved Son, and that we ought to hear and obey him. It is this Son of God who would not permit his disciples to call down fire from heaven after the example of Elias, telling them that they did not know what spirit they were of, and that he did not come to destroy men as did Elias, but to save. It is this Son of God who has told us to come after him, and that those before him were thieves and robbers, and that is what they are who without his commandment and example, rather in fact against his commandment and example, force consciences. They cannot say that they are after Christ; rather they are before, and they show thereby that they are thieves and robbers.⁴⁶

One cannot but note that the application of the historical method to the Old Testament has effected a very genuine relief both for religion and for morals.

⁴⁴ *Mémoires, etc.*, III, 294: Mais un tel y peut estre poussé avec cause & regards si urgens qu'en ce cas il n'est plus privé.

⁴⁵ Cited by Nikolaus Paulus, *Protestantismus und Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert*, 1911, p. 196 note 4.

⁴⁶ *Conseil à la France Désolée*, pp. 36-38 (the only copy in this country, to my knowledge, is at Cornell): Mais la plus grande raison de toutes, c'est que nous sommes sous Christ, la doctrine & exemple duquel nous devons ensuire, quoy que autres ayent dit ou fait, uen que le pere nous a dit que c'est son cher fils, & que nous le devons escouter & luy obeir. C'est ce fils de Dieu, qui ne permet point à ses disciples de faire descendre le feu du ciel à l'exemple d'Elie, leur disant qu'ils ne scauint de quel esperit ilz estoient, & qu'il n'estoit point venu pour oster la vie aux hommes, comme Elie, mais pour la sauuer. C'est ce filz de Dieu qui nous a dit que nous allions apres luy: & que tous ceux qui sont deuant luy, sont larrons & brigans: ce que sont ceux qui sans son commandement & exemple, uoient contre son commandement & exemple, forcent les consciences. Car ilz ne peuvent dire qu'ilz uoient apres Christ, mais si bien deuant: en quoy ilz se monstrent larrons & brigans.

THE ATHENS TEXT OF ATHANASIUS, CONTRA GENTES AND DE INCARNATIONE

ROBERT P. CASEY

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

I

IN the Harvard Theological Review for July 1926 attention was called to a manuscript of the works of St. Athanasius (Athens, National Library 428) which is of interest as the oldest Greek witness to a recension of *De Incarnatione* recently discovered by Professor Lebon of Louvain.¹ Further investigation of this manuscript, and especially an examination of its text of *Contra Gentes*, raises new problems in the textual history of Athanasius's works and adds to our knowledge of the recension of *De Incarnatione* discovered by Lebon.

The principal characteristic of the Athens text (Ath) of *Contra Gentes* is its brevity, for omissions are indicated in every few lines of the collation. A small proportion of these are due to homoioteleuton or itacism, for instance Migne, P. G. XXV, 12.7-8 om ἀλλ' . . . κινεῖσθαι; 29.38 om καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτό; 32.44 om καὶ . . . ἄλλων; 69.19-31 om καὶ οἶόν τι . . . γινώσκεισθαι; 76.35-36 om καὶ ἡ τάξις . . . οὐ πολλοὺς; 80.1-3 om καὶ ἀνομοίους . . . τὰς κινήσεις; 81.37-38 om διὸ . . . σύνθετος (but added in the margin). In one case, 28.21-29.33, a page had dropped out of the manuscript before the present numbering was made, but in several instances it is doubtful whether omission was deliberate or accidental. Thus 65.36-41 om ἡ γὰρ . . . τις ἴδοι, where the following sentence begins εἰ γὰρ κτλ.; 85.51-54 om ὁ τέκτων . . . ἀνέρχεται, where the preceding sentence ends with κατέρχεται; and 76.25-32 om ἡ μὲν . . . βλέπωμεν αὐτήν, where the preceding sentence ends with αὐτόν, may be cases of itacism, but they occur in close connection with other abbreviations of the printed text and thus cause no break in the sense. These are merely illustrations, not an exhaustive list.

¹ Cf. J. Lebon, *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXI, pp. 525 ff.; XXIII, pp. 15 ff.

A much larger group of passages contain omissions which are plainly not accidental but are evidence of either a deliberate abbreviation of the ordinary text (that of the printed editions) or a deliberate expansion of the recension represented by Ath. These are:

5.52-8.7	om οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . συναπτόμενος
9.31	om τούτῳ . . . ἐπιθυμίας ²
12.4	om δεικνύουσα . . . καί (before νομίζουσα)
13.43	om καὶ . . . εἴποι
40.47-48	om εἴποι κρινούσῃ
49.1-2	om ἄλλων ἔτι τε καί
49.10-11	om θεῶν . . . ἀνθρώπους
52.34-35	om οἱ ἐπαναβεβηκότες . . . ἐπτοημένοι
52.36-38	om εὐκατάγνωστα . . . καὶ αὐτοί
53.8	om τὸν καὶ . . . βασιλεύοντα τὸν
53.25	om καὶ . . . οἶον
56.4	om κατὰ . . . εἰπόντας
56.34-36	om οὗτος . . . ἀποδείξει
64.21-24	om χώρας . . . προγινώσκων
64.25-26	om ἐν ᾗ . . . ἄνθρωπος
64.41	om ὥς . . . λύρα
65.2-5	om τίς ὁ ταῦτα . . . ἡνιοχέεται
65.26-27	om καὶ οὐχὶ . . . κινεῖται
65.34-35	om μᾶλλον . . . ἀνάγκης καί
65.45	om μὴ . . . θανάτῳ
68.5-6	om εἰ γὰρ . . . πλέον
68.20	om καὶ κατάληψιν
68.45-53	om κατ' εἰκόνα . . . τὸν λόγον
72.45-47	om τῶν ἐλαφρῶν . . . καὶ πάλιν
73.13-15	om φύσει . . . φιλιάζοντα
73.16-20	om τὸ βαρὺ . . . νεφέλαις
73.20-21	om ἀνομοίου . . . φύσεως
76.4	om οὕτω . . . συνέστηκεν
77.3-6	om ὅτι μὴ . . . συνηχοῦσι καί
77.9-10	om ἦχον . . . ἐπιστήμη ³

² Ath also omits the preceding μεταποιεῖ.

³ Minor changes in the context support the structure of the sentence.

77.29	om <i>ὅτι</i> . . . <i>ἀπετελέσθη</i>
81.1-3	om <i>τὸν ἐν</i> . . . <i>δὴ καὶ</i> ⁴
81.4-6	om <i>ἀλλὰ</i> . . . <i>ἐπιστήμην</i>
81.18	om <i>ἀναρτήσας</i> . . . <i>κειμένην</i>
84.9-10	om <i>καὶ</i> . . . <i>θεῶ</i>
84.28-42	om <i>τάς τε ἀρχὰς</i> . . . <i>ὡς προείρηται</i>
84.48-85.6	om <i>οἶον γὰρ</i> . . . <i>καὶ θελήματι</i>
85.46	om <i>ἄλλος</i> . . . <i>προέρχεται</i>
85.47-48	om <i>ἐπὶ τὴν</i> . . . <i>ὁ μὲν</i>
85.48-49	om <i>ὁ δὲ ἄρχων</i> . . . <i>θεσμοθετεῖν</i> ⁵

An examination of these passages in their context leaves little doubt that the Long Recension ⁶ is the original and that the Athens text is a revision of it. Strong evidence for this comes from a group of brief passages which do not sufficiently enrich the meaning to be regarded as editorial additions but which would naturally be eliminated by a reviser who wished to shorten the text, for example:

⁴ Ath adds *ὃν* after *φημι οὐχ*.

⁵ The sentence *ἐκείνου γὰρ κτλ.* (85.42 ff.) has been considerably and characteristically reduced in Ath, which reads, *καθάπερ τοῖνυν ἐκείνου παρόντος καὶ πρὸς πάντας τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τείνοντος ἐπόμενοι πάντες τὴν ἐαυτῶν τάξιν ἀποτελοῦσιν· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν γεωργίαν· εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑδραγωγούς ὑδρευόμενοι σπεύδουσιν· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν βουλήν βαδίζει· ὁ δὲ δικαστὴς ἐπὶ τὸ δικάζειν προέρχεται κτλ.*

⁶ The terms 'Long Recension' and 'Short Recension' will be used to distinguish the text of S (Cod. Coislin. 45) and its allies from that of Ath. An unfortunate inconsistency between the presentation of evidence for *Contra Gentes* and that for *De Incarnatione* has been unavoidable. The collation of the former is made with the Benedictine edition as reprinted in Migne. This is an eclectic text, based on S and some other manuscripts; since all these manuscripts represent the Long Recension, it has seemed advisable not to confuse the reader by constant corrections of the printed text so as to conform with that of S. Most of the important readings of S which are not adopted can be found in the apparatus in Migne. For *De Incarnatione*, Robertson's edition of the text of S has been used, and it is worth noting that Robertson's guess that II (Cod. Toblerianus, Brit. Mus., Harl. 5579) is an independent witness to the archetype of S is right, for in a number of instances where II differs from S, it agrees with Ath. It must also be remembered that whereas Ath is the only known witness to the Short Recension of *Contra Gentes*, Doch (Dochiarion 78) and Vat. Syr. 104 also supply texts of the Short Recension of *De Incarnatione*. With Professor Lebon's kind permission I have made occasional use of Doch and the Syriac to distinguish singular readings.

56.4	om κατὰ τοὺς περὶ τούτων εἰπόντας
56.34-36	om οὗτος δὲ ὁ λόγος . . . ἀποδείξει
65.26-27	om καὶ οὐχί . . . κινεῖται
68.20	om καὶ κατάληψιν
73.13-15	om φύσει . . . φιλιάζοντα
76.4	om οὕτω γὰρ καὶ νῦν συνέστηκεν
81.18	om ἀναρτήσας . . . κειμένην
85.46	om ἄλλος . . . προέρχεται.

In these cases omission does not disturb the sense, but in others an adaptation of the text was necessary to conceal the gap. Occasionally this is done with some skill, as in 68.45 ff. where the omission of κατ' εἰκόνα . . . τὸν λόγον makes impossible the conclusion of the sentence, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ . . . λογίζεται, so that the editor omits 69.1 εἰκὼν . . . λογίζεται and substitutes, with rhetorical finish, λόγος καὶ κύριος καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, neatly concealing his omission. Two sentences are similarly combined, and the explanatory matter reduced, in 81.1-3 τὸν ἐν . . . δὴ καί; 81.4-6 om ἀλλὰ ἐπιστήμην. An omission in 72.43 ff. required a more complicated adaptation of the text, and a comparison of Ath with the printed text at this point illustrates well the methods of the reviser:

Migne, P. G. XXV, 72.41 ff.

αὐτὰ μὲν γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὰ οὐκ ἀν-
 συσταίη καὶ φανῆναι ποτε δυναθεῖη
 διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα τῆς φύσεως
 ἐναντιότητα. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὕδωρ φύσει
 βαρὺ καὶ κάτω ρέον ἐστίν, αἱ δὲ
 νεφέλαι κοῦφαι καὶ τῶν ἐλαφρῶν καὶ
 τῶν ἀνωφερῶν τυγχάνουσι. καὶ ὅμως
 τὸ βαρύτερον ὕδωρ ὀρώμεν ἐν ταῖς
 νεφέλαις βασταζόμενον. καὶ πάλιν
 ἡ μὲν γῆ βαρυτάτη ἐστί, τὸ δ' αὖ
 πάλιν ὕδωρ κουφότερόν ἐστι ταύτης·
 καὶ ὅμως ὑπὸ τῶν ἐλαφροτέρων τὸ
 βαρύτερον βαστάζεται καὶ οὐ κατα-
 φέρεται, ἀλλ' ἔστηκεν ἀκίνητος ἡ γῆ.

Athens codex, p. 332

δι' ἣν τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὰ μηδέποτε συνελ-
 θόντα καὶ συναφθέντα διὰ τὴν πρὸς
 ἄλληλα τῆς φύσεως ἐναντιότητα·
 ὅμως συνάπτεται. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὕδωρ
 ὥσπερ εἴρηται φύσει βαρὺ καὶ κάτω
 νεῦόν ἐστιν· αἱ δὲ νεφέλαι κοῦφαι·
 καὶ ἡ μὲν γῆ βαρυτάτη· τὸ δ' αὖ πάλιν
 ὕδωρ κουφότερόν ἐστιν ταύτης· καὶ
 ὑπὸ μὲν νεφελῶν βαστάζεται· αὐτὸ
 δὲ τῆς συμπάσης γῆς ἕρισμα καὶ
 θεμέλιος γίγνεται.

Such combinations are, however, not always happy, and in several passages where cuts have been made the seams are

rough. Thus in 52.34–38 the omissions impoverish the sentence and make it abrupt and harsh. In 77.9–10, also, the omission of ἡχον . . . ἐπιστήμην produces an inferior text but one not bad enough to tempt an editor to expand it. In 65.31 ff. the reviser has bungled his work still more:

Migne, P. G. XXV, 65.31 ff.

Athens codex, p. 327

εἰ μὲν οὖν καὶ αὕτη ὑπὸ τοῦ σώματος
ἐκινεῖτο, ἀκόλουθον ἦν, ἀναχωροῦντος
καὶ κινουντος, ἀποθνήσκειν αὐτήν. εἰ
δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ κινεῖ καὶ τὸ σῶμα, ἀνάγκη
μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ἑαυτὴν κινεῖν, ἑαυτῇ δὲ
κινουμένη, ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ μετὰ τὸν
τοῦ σώματος θάνατον ζῇ. ἡ γὰρ
κίνησις τῆς ψυχῆς οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν
ἢ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτῆς. ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ τὸ
σῶμα τότε ζῆν λέγομεν, ὅτε κινεῖται,
καὶ τότε θάνατον αὐτοῦ εἶναι, ὅτε τῆς
κινήσεως παύεται. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ
τῆς ἐν σώματι καθάπαξ εὐεργείας
αὐτῆς φανερώτερον ἢ τις ἴδοι. εἰ γὰρ
καὶ ὅτε κτλ.

εἰ μὲν οὖν καὶ αὕτη ὑπὸ τοῦ σώματος
ἐκινεῖτο (ἐκινεῖτο m. sec.), ἀκόλου-
θον ἦν, ἀποθνήσκοντος τοῦ κινουντος
συναποθνήσκειν καὶ αὐτήν. εἰ δὲ τῇ
παρουσίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ σῶμα ζῇ,
ἀνάγκη πᾶσα καὶ μετὰ τὸν τοῦ
σώματος θάνατον ζῇ αὐτήν. καὶ
πάλιν, εἰ καὶ ὅτε κτλ.

As in De Incarnatione, the Athens text of Contra Gentes contains numerous passages which are alternatives to the text of the Long Recension, for example:

- 5.18 om ὅτι . . . καταλαμβάνεται and add τὸν πάντα κόσμον
ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταλαμβάνόμενον
- 9.36–37 om τὴν φύσιν . . . εὐκίνητος and add γενομένη, ὥσπερ
εἶπον, ἀθάνατος
- 20.45–46 om αὕτη ἡ . . . πλασαμένων and add αὕτη ἡ ἐπιθυμία
παρὰ τῶν πλασαμένων
- 21.28–29 om ὦ . . . μανίας and add τίς οὖν ταύτης μᾶλλον
γένοιτ' ἂν ἐναντιότης καὶ μαρία
- 24.13–15 om σοφὸς . . . Πλάτων and add σοφὸς εἶναι δόξας
Πλάτων
- 33.30–31 om κατ' ἀλλήλους . . . χρή and add κατ' ἀλλήλους δὲ
ταῖς πράξεσιν καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις καὶ ταῖς προσηγορίαις
εἶναι χρή

- 40.34 om φιλοσοφώτεροι καὶ βαθύτερα and add δῆθεν ἀκριβέστερον καὶ βαθύτερον
- 41.50–44.19 om οὐ δίκαιον . . . ἀξιῶν μαθεῖν and add ποῖον σύμβολον ἐν τούτοις τῆς περὶ θεοῦ νοήσεως, τί ὅμοιον ἄνθρωπος ἢ τετράποδον καὶ ἔρπετόν τῆς περὶ θεοῦ σημασίας; ἐν μὲν οὖν χάρτῃ γραφόμενον τὸ βασιλέως ὄνομα θεωρήσας, τίς οἶδεν, ὅτι περὶ βασιλέως ἤκουσεν; ἀνθρώπου δὲ μορφήν τίς; ἢ ἀλόγων ζώων θεωρήσας, ποῖον ἔξει σύμβολον ἢ γνώρισμα τῆς περὶ θεοῦ γνώσεως, ἵνα καὶ τὰς τούτων ἐν λίθοις εἰκόνας εἴπητε ταῦτα εἶναι γράμματα τῆς περὶ θεοῦ ἐννοίας; ἐβουλόμην δὲ ἰδεῖν, εἰ βουλόμενοι γράψαι καὶ εἰκόνα στήσαι βασιλέως, ἐγράφετε τετράποδα ἢ ἔρπετά, καὶ οὐ πάντα μᾶλλον εἰ τοῦτ' ἐπιχείρειται (sic) διὰ τὸν ἐκ τούτου κίνδυνον, εἰ δὲ, ἂ μὴ περὶ ἀνθρώπων τολμᾷτε ποιεῖν, ταῦτα περὶ θεοῦ ἐπιτηδεύετε πλάττειν, πῶς οὐ πάσης ἄξια καταγνώσεως τὰ παρ' ὑμῖν, καὶ γὰρ πάλιν ἄξιον ὑμᾶς ἐρέσθαι καὶ ἀκοῦσαι παρ' ὑμῶν τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τοιαύτης τῶν εἰδώλων ὑμῶν μορφῆς
- 56.47–50 om καὶ . . . λόγου and add οὐδὲ σελήνη καὶ γῆ· οὐδὲ γῆ καὶ θάλαττα
- 64.41–46 om πῶς . . . ἢ τίς and add καὶ τὴν μὲν κατὰ φύσιν οὔσαν ἀκουστικὴν ἀποκλείει τοῦ ἀκοῦειν
- 65.33 om ἡ ψυχὴ and add ἡ παρουσία τῆς ψυχῆς
- 72.41–42 om οὐκ ἂν . . . δυνηθεῖη and add μηδέποτε συνελθόντα καὶ συναφθέντα ⁷
- 77.17–21 om οὐδὲ γὰρ . . . γνώρισμα γάρ and add καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν ⁸
- 80.9 om πλήττων εἴη τεχνίτης and add εἴη καθ' ἐπιστήμην ψάλλων
- 80.19–21 om ἀλλ' ὅτι . . . πιστεύειν εἶναι and add ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦθ' ἕνα κόσμον πεποίηκεν, ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα καὶ γνώρισμα πᾶσιν παρέχῃ ἕνα εἶναι τὸν τοῦτον δημιουργήσαντα θεόν

⁷ The sentence in Ath reads, δι' ἣν τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὰ μηδέποτε συνελθόντα καὶ συναφθέντα διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα τῆς φύσεως ἐναντιότητα. ὁμῶς συνάπτεται, τὸ μὲν γὰρ κτλ.

⁸ Ath omits τοῦτο in 77.22.

- 80.47-48 om παντὶ κόσμῳ διακεκόσμηται and add τὸν πάντα κόσμον διακεκοσμήσθαι
- 81.14-16 om τὴν τῶν . . . ἀρμονίαν and add τὰ πάντα διεκόσμησεν καὶ ἤρμοσεν
- 81.20-22 om μεμετρημένον . . . κρεμᾶται and add φθίνουσα πληροῦται
- 85.10-11 om τὸ γὰρ . . . ἐστίν and add καὶ τοῦτό ἐστίν αὐτοῦ τὸ παράδοξον

Two cases illustrate so admirably the reviser's method that they should receive fuller treatment:

Migne, P. G. XXV, 64.21 ff.

Athens codex, p. 326

πολλάκις γοῦν κειμένου τοῦ σώματος ἐπὶ γῆς, τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς φαντάζεται καὶ θεωρεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος· καὶ πολλάκις τοῦ σώματος ἡρεμοῦντος καὶ ἡσυχάζοντος καὶ καθεύδοντος κινεῖται ἐνδον ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ τὰ ἔξωθεν ἑαυτοῦ θεωρεῖ, χώρας ἀποδημῶν καὶ περιπατῶν, καὶ ἀπαντῶν τοῖς γνωρίμοις, καὶ πολλάκις διὰ τούτων τὰς μεθ' ἡμέραν πράξεις ἑαυτοῦ μαντευόμενος καὶ προγινώσκων. τοῦτο δὲ τί ἂν εἴη ἕτερον ἢ ψυχὴ λογικὴ, ἐν ᾗ λογίζεται καὶ νοεῖ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος;

πολλάκις γοῦν τοῦ σώματος κινουμένου ἐπὶ γῆς, τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς φαντάζεται καὶ θεωρεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος· καὶ πολλάκις τοῦ σώματος ἡσυχάζοντος καὶ ἡρεμοῦντος καὶ καθεύδοντος, ἐνδοθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος κινεῖται· καὶ τῷ μὲν θυμοῦται πρὸς ἄλλον δὲ λυπεῖται· καὶ ἄλλων μὲν ὀρέγεται· ἐστίν δ' ὅτε τὰ βέλτιστα διαλογίζεται καὶ φρονεῖ. καὶ τὰ ἔξωθεν τοῦ σώματος θεωρεῖ. τοῦτο δ' ἔτι ἂν εἴη ἕτερον ἢ ψυχὴ λογικὴ.

Migne, P. G. XXV, 85.17-42

om ὅμου γὰρ . . . καὶ βασιλέως and add ὡς γέγονεν δι' αὐτοῦ (cf. 85.21 ἀποτελεῖται δι' αὐτοῦ) καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν οὐκ ἄπιστον. ὅπου γε καὶ μεγάλη πόλις ὑπὸ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ καὶ αὐτὴν οἰκοδομήσαντος ἄρχοντος τοιαύτην ἔχει τὴν ἐπιμελείαν (cf. 85.39-41 ἢ ἵνα . . . βασιλέως).

In both instances it is interesting to observe how the reviser has worked into the text phrases reminiscent of the passage he has rejected.

A study of these passages strengthens the argument that the Long Recension, not the text of Ath, is original. In some cases there seems little to choose between the alternatives, and oc-

casionally Ath appears to be expansive, but in the majority of its readings its abbreviating character is unmistakable. This is especially clear in passages like 64.21 ff., where a readjustment of the context has been necessary to compensate for the omission, and in 85.17-42, where some of the omitted matter is worked into the abbreviated form. In neither case does the longer text read like a natural or significant expansion of the text of Ath.

It is not to be supposed, however, that the text of Ath is merely an abbreviation of the Long Recension, for we have already noticed that even in cases of substitution it is not invariably the less elaborate of the two. In 65.33 and in 80.19 the text of the Long Recension is shorter and better than that of Ath; in 81.14 Ath is briefer but inferior. Ath not only omits and substitutes, it also adds to the Long Recension, for example:

- 12.46 ἐγνωκότες + ἐνόμισαν καὶ πρὸ τῶν γεννητῶν
 13.47 αὐτοῦ ἔργων + οὐδὲ τῶν ἀπαγγειλάντων περὶ αὐτοῦ
 64.20 κινεῖται + καὶ τῷ μὲν θυμοῦται, πρὸς ἄλλον δὲ λυπεῖται·
 καὶ ἄλλων ἐν ὀρέγεται· ἔστιν δ' ὅτε τὰ βέλτιστα
 διαλογίζεται καὶ φρονεῖ
 72.43 ἐναντιότητα + ὁμῶς συνάπτεται ⁹
 ὑδωρ + ὥσπερ εἴρηται
 84.47 λόγος + οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν
 85.44 πάντες + τὴν ἐαυτῶν τάξιν ἀποτελοῦσιν καὶ
 85.48 δικάζειν + προέρχεται ¹⁰

Of these 12.45 and 13.47 appear to be deliberate additions made for the sake of greater accuracy; 64.21, 72.43, 85.44, and 85.48 form part of more extensive revisions of their contexts; and 84.47 completes a biblical quotation. Taken by itself, this group of additions furnishes no decisive evidence for the priority of the text either of the Short or of the Long Recension, but in conjunction with the peculiar combination of omissions, additions, and substitutions which a comparison of the two recensions reveals, it can hardly be explained except as part of a deliberate revision of the whole treatise.

⁹ Cf. above, note 7.

¹⁰ Cf. above, note 5.

II

In our previous article attention was directed to the longer, and in their content more interesting, passages where Ath and the Paris codex (S) present divergent forms of text. Only a general impression, however, can be gained from these, and the minor variants, in which there is less difference in meaning, offer a better opportunity of comparing the literary character and procedure of the two recensions and of settling the question as to which recension is original. A study of these minor variants in *De Incarnatione* confirms the impression gained from similar readings in *Contra Gentes* that the Long Recension is earlier than the Short Recension. As in *Contra Gentes*, a comparison of the two recensions shows omissions, substitutions, and additions, but the balance of probability is favorable to the priority of the Long Recension, for the majority of passages omitted by Ath are not such as would naturally be added by a reviser having the text of Ath before him.

Specimens of omission by Ath in *De Incarnatione* are the following:

7.7-8	om ὄντα δὲ . . . γεγόνασι
10.27-28	om δὲ ἡ μετάνοια
12.7-8	om ἐδύνατο . . . τοῦ φανῆναι
16.3	om τοῦ σωτήρος
21.9	om καὶ ἀνακτιζομένην
21.25-27	om ἦν γὰρ . . . ἐκυλίοντο
23.14	om ἐν ἀνθρώποις
23.24	om τὸν κύριον ἀληθινὸν τόν
24.9	om μόνον
24.20	om εἰς πλάτος . . . κόσμον
26.11-12	om καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν ὁρώμενος
26.16	om ὁ καὶ . . . κύριος
27.7-8	om εἰ οὐ . . . δὲ ποιῶ
27.9-10	om ἵνα γινώτε . . . τῷ πατρί
30.4	om δι' ὃ . . . ἐπεδήμησε
30.12-18	om καὶ μήτοι . . . γραφῆναι
31.13	om πιστοί

31.14	om πανομένης καί
34.17	om ἐκ νεκρῶν
35.8-13	om εἰ γάρ . . . ἀπιστίας
35.30	om θάνατον
40.5-6	om φοβερός . . . θάνατος
40.14-17	om ἐκεῖνος . . . ὅτι ¹²
40.19	om πίστιν καί
43.6	om καὶ καταπατηθέντος
44.11	om καὶ πέπνυται

Comparison with the Athos codex, Dochiarion 78 (Doch), and the Syriac version (known to me through the kindness of Professor Lebon from the Roman codex Vat. Syr. 104) shows that several of these omissions are peculiarities not of the Short Recension itself but of Ath. Thus 10.27-28 om δὲ ἡ μετάνοια Ath; 16.3 om τοῦ σωτῆρος Ath; and 44.11 om καὶ πέπνυται Ath are unsupported by Doch and the Syriac, and in 23.24-26 the omission of τὸν κύριον ἀληθινὸν τὸν by Ath is evidently a 'singular' omission from the longer text, for Doch reads τὸν κύριον ἀληθινόν, although it carelessly omits τὸν before τοῦ πατρός.¹³ In 27.7-10 the shorter quotation probably represents the original text of the Short Recension, and is supported by Ath and the Syriac, although Doch agrees with S in giving the longer form.¹⁴ The passages 7.7-8, 21.25-27, 23.14, 30.4, 31.13, 31.14, 34.17, 35.30, 40.14-17, and 40.19 are inconclusive, but seem to be more naturally explained as omissions than as expansions. The passage 30.12-18 is the apologia of the Long Recension and is naturally omitted by the abbreviator, who also omits 35.8-13, which is an example of the method assumed in 30.12 ff. The omissions in 12.7-8, 21.9, 26.11-12, 26.16, 40.5-6, and 43.6 are by homoioteleuton from the text of S; and 24.20 is almost equally strong proof of the priority

¹² In Ath, Doch, and the Syriac, the following sentence begins ἡ διὰ τί πρὶν κτλ.

¹³ The Syriac reads (f. 26 a. 10-12) **ܟܠܟ ܡܪܕܟ ܡܪܝܡܠܐ ܟܠܟ ܠܝܝܢܐ ܡܪܠܟ ܟܝܝܝܬ**, which represents καὶ μόνον (τὸν?) θεὸν ἀληθινόν (τὸν?) λόγον τοῦ κυρίου (τοῦ?) πατρός.

¹⁴ Doch reads 27.7 πιστεύετε, 27.8 om μοι post πιστεύετε, 27.8 πιστεύηται, 27.9 om μοι, 27.9 πιστεύετε, 27.9 γινώτε καὶ πιστεύετε. Therefore Doch may give an expansion of the quotation independent of the text of the Long Recension.

of the Long Recension, since the matter omitted by Ath is necessary to the completion of the argument.

Notable alternative texts, apart from those mentioned in our previous article, are the following:

- 27.29-30 om *ὅτι . . . τῆς γενέσεως* and add *ὁ διδοὺς κύριος ὧν τῆς γενέσεως*
- 28.1 om *πρὸς ἡμᾶς* and add *εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους τόπους*
- 29.5 *οὐκ ἄνθρωπον εἶναι* for *οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἶναι ἄνθρωπον*
- 29.6 *λόγον* for *νιόν*
- 29.15 *τὸ τέλος τοῦ σώματος* for *ὁ τοῦ σώματος θάνατος*
- 33.17-20 om *ὅτι καὶ . . . τελειῶσαι* and add *καὶ τὸ γινόμενον ὑπὲρ τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας τελειούμενον*
- 34.2-4 om *ἧς . . . ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα* and add *ἦν πᾶσιν ὥσπερ ἐνέχυρον καὶ γνώρισμα τῆς ἐπὶ πάντας ἐσομένης τετήρηκεν ἄφθαρτον τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ*
- 36.11-12 om *εἶναι δεινόν . . . ἡνείχετο* and add *εἶναι δεινόν καὶ πικρόν ἐν σταυρῷ τοῦτον ἐδέχετο*
- 39.4 om *ἐγίνετο . . . κλέος* and add *ἐγίνετο τῆς ἀφθαρσίας ἡ χάρις*
- 40.25-28 om *οὐ μόνον . . . παρειμένον* and add *εἰδότες ὅτι πάσης ἰσχύος κεκένωνται καὶ λοιπὸν αὐτὸς ἐστὶν νεκρὸς*
- 44.8 ἐν Χριστῷ εἰς θεόν for *εἰς Χριστόν*

A study of these passages in their context yields little result, for in some cases Ath, in others S, seems to have the better reading, and the evidence for the consistent priority of either is disappointing. In 27.29-30, 33.17-20, 36.11-12, 39.4, and 40.25-28 the text of Ath is simpler, and it is difficult to suppose that the redundancy of S was deliberately substituted, but it is equally difficult to see why in 28.1 *εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους τόπους* should have been substituted for the simple *πρὸς ἡμᾶς* of S, or why in 44.8 *εἰς Χριστόν* should have been elaborated into *ἐν Χριστῷ εἰς θεόν*.

Ath supplies the following significant additions to the text of S:

- 8.3 *ἀϊδιότητος + ἐποίησεν αὐτόν*
- 12.30-13.1 *ἀποθανεῖν + ἐν αὐτῷ*¹⁵

¹⁵ Ath reads 12.30 *πάντας* for *πάντως*.

18.16	γνῶναι + τὸν δημιουργὸν καὶ
22.12	ἔργων + τὴν διδασκαλίαν ποιεῖται περιπολῶν, ὡς ἥλιος διὰ τῶν ἐν σώματι ἔργων
25.2	εἶναι + θεοῦ υἱόν· καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι
31.27-28	θάνατε + τὸ νίκος; ποῦ σου ἄδη
35.3	εἶχον + ἐν τῷ ¹⁶
35.22	ἐπινοῆσαι + τοιούτων
38.25	φέρων + τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
38.25	σώματι + αὐτοῦ
42.19	τοῦ Χριστοῦ + κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου νίκης. ¹⁷

Of these 8.3 and 31.27 complete biblical quotations; 12.30, 35.3, 35.22, 38.25, and 42.19 appear inconclusive, but, as in the similar cases of alternatives, the longer text of S seems unmotivated and redundant.

The passages 18.16, 22.12, and 25.2 constitute a group more difficult to explain, since they appear to be omissions by homoioteleuton from the text of Ath and so to run counter to our claim for the priority of the Long Recension. 18.16, however, is an accretion to the text of the Short Recension, for although it is contained in Ath and Doch, it is omitted by the Syriac. The two remaining omissions found in Ath, Doch, and the Syriac are offset by the two groups of omissions through homoioteleuton from the text of S (cf. pp. 52f., 59f.), and their explanation must, therefore, be sought in the history of the transmission of the Long Recension. S and its allies are relatively late manuscripts, and it is quite likely that in 18.16 and 22.12 some ancestor of theirs omitted by homoioteleuton readings which now survive only in representatives of the Short Recension. These two omissions, therefore, are not properly characteristic of the Long Recension, but errors which must be assigned to an early period in the history of its transmission. Similarly two readings of a dogmatic character may be attributed to some critical scribe. In 24.9 om *μόνον* Ath, and in 29.5 om *ἀπλῶς* Ath, the text of S is apparently a guarded re-

* ¹⁶ The succeeding phrase in Ath reads *περὶ τοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως λόγῳ*, but in Doch the awkward *τοῦ* before *τῆς* is omitted.

¹⁷ In all these cases Doch agrees with Ath, except in 22.12, where, in agreement with the Syriac, it misreads *περὶ πολλῶν* for *περιπολῶν*.

vision of expressions which are capable of an Apollinarian or Monophysite interpretation.

III

The question now arises for what purpose and by whom the revision was made. Since *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione* are two parts of the same book, there can be no doubt that the revision of both was made by the same person for similar reasons, and this is confirmed by the fact that the long additions and alternative texts exhibit the same general mental character and purpose as the omitted passages. The principal aim of the reviser seems to have been to produce a briefer text, for the differences between the two recensions do not materially affect the content or significance of the treatises, and in more than one passage the diffuse and repetitious exposition of the Long Recension has been remedied. It is important to emphasize that no strong dogmatic motive can be detected in the reviser's work. In *De Incarnatione* occasional variants appear which suggest dogmatic preoccupation, but, at least until Lebon has put all the evidence before us, it is impossible to say whether these are characteristics of the revision or merely incidents in the history of its transmission. In any case it is clear that they do not constitute the principal motive of the later recension. In our discussion of the Athens text of *De Incarnatione* we suggested that the uniform character of the two recensions could best be explained by supposing that Athanasius himself had made the revision. In a period of such vigorous discussion and rapid development in christology it is almost inconceivable that any one but the original author or one closely associated with him could have revised the work without leaving easily recognizable traces of later controversies. The discovery that *Contra Gentes* was similarly revised, and that its revision, like that of *De Incarnatione*, fails to reveal other than a literary purpose, considerably strengthens the theory that either Athanasius or one of his immediate disciples was responsible for the later revision.

In view of the complicated nature of the evidence it is necessary to make three classes for the alternative readings in *Contra*

Gentes and De Incarnatione: (1) the original recension, (2) the revised recension, (3) scribal errors and emendations. The study of the minor variants in both treatises makes it appear probable that the Long and not the Short Recension is the original, but the question is one of psychology rather than of textual criticism, and unanimity on such complicated evidence will hardly be expected. Similar differences of opinion may be expected also in the classification of the minor variants. The line cannot always be drawn with certainty between scribal emendations and slight changes of the reviser. It is a general and happy assumption that errors and infelicities are due to scribes, but it is possible that some may have descended from the author, especially as we have seen that alterations of style and slight changes of meaning are frequent in the differences between the two recensions. This difficulty is felt especially in *Contra Gentes*,* where Ath is the only representative of the Short Recension and therefore cannot be controlled in its singular readings by comparison with Doch and the Syriac.

The principal importance of the Athens manuscript for the text of *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione* is the evidence it supplies for the Short Recension of these two treatises. The fact that this recension involved *Contra Gentes* as well as *De Incarnatione* not only adds to our knowledge of the text of *Contra Gentes*, but also helps in determining the character of the whole revision, and this help is the more useful as the subject matter of *Contra Gentes* is far less controversial than that of *De Incarnatione*, so that there could be little temptation to revise it on dogmatic grounds. Furthermore, the Athens text of *De Incarnatione* has special value as a witness to the shorter recension, independent of Doch and the Syriac. Fuller evidence for this will be forthcoming in Lebon's study of these two manuscripts, but it can be stated with confidence that the differences between the three witnesses point to an interesting development of variants, some of a dogmatic character, in the transmission of the Short Recension.

Collations of the text of the two treatises in the Athens codex are appended.

Contra Gentes

The collation is made with Migne's reprint of the Benedictine edition,
and the numbers refer to the columns of Migne.

τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου ἀθανασίου περὶ πίστεως καὶ κατὰ τῆς τῶν
εἰδώλων εὐρέσεως

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4A.2 om τῶν | 10 add πρόφασιν της after τὴν |
| 4 γνώρισμα for γνώριμον | ἀμαθίας for ἀμαθίαν, appar- |
| 8 θεόν for Χριστὸν | ently erasure and cor- |
| 11 οὖν for γὰρ | rection to ἰ from εἰ |
| 14 ἂν for ἐάν | ἐλεγχθέντων for διελεγχθέν- |
| 15 ἐντυχῶν for ἐντύχοι | των |
| 4B.4 om καὶ after ταῦτα | 5C.12 κυρίου for σωτήρος |
| 5 πάντων before σωτήρα | 16 ιδιότητος |
| 10 ἀφ' ᾧν for ἐφ' ᾧ | 5D.3 συζήσεως erasure of one let- |
| 14 om ἔργα | ter between υ and ζ |
| 5A.2 om τὸν νοῦν | 7 om τὸν before ἀθάνατον |
| ἐχλεύασαν for ἐχλεύαζον | 5D.7-8A.7 om οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . συναπ- |
| ἂν before τὸ | τόμενος |
| 5 σωτηρίαν for θεραπείαν | 8A.9 om ἄνω |
| 6 εἰδώλων λατρεία for εἰδωλα- | 8B.7 ἔστιν καὶ |
| τρεία | 8 φησὶν καὶ ὁ κύριος |
| 10 ὡσήμεραι | 12 μὲν ἦν for μένειν |
| 13-14 θεὸν καὶ σωτήρα for θεοῦ . . . | 13 κατοληγωρήσαντες |
| σωτήρα | 8C.2 τούτων for τοῦτοις |
| 14-15 τὸν σταύρον | 3 om ἐαυτῶν τὸν νοῦν |
| 15 καὶ οὗτοι after μοι | 5 γε for τε |
| 5B.1-2 ἐσκεπασμένον for σκεπόμενον | 10 τῆς for εἰς |
| 2-3 βλέπων τὸν πάντα κόσμον ὑπ' | ἐπιθυμίας for ἐπιθυμίαν |
| αὐτοῦ καταλαμπόμενον for | 15 πάσης ἐπιθυμίας |
| βλέπων . . . καταλάμπεται | 8D.1 γραφαί before περὶ |
| 4 κάλλιον for καλλίων | 3 add ἐπὶ τοσοῦτω before |
| 6 πεπληρωκότος for πεπληρώσ- | ἀπεστρέφετο |
| θαι | 7 add δὴ before καὶ εἰς |
| 8 λέγομεν apparently erasure | 9A.1 γινώντες for γινόντες |
| after ο (probably ω) | 2 ἐνδύματος |
| 9 ἡμεῖς before ὡς | 3 ὅσον for ἀλλ' |
| om ἡμῖν | 5 δὲ for γὰρ |
| ἐλέξαντες for διελέξαντες | 7 om εἰς before διαφόρους |

- 11 ταῦτα for ταύτας
δειλία
- 9B.2 αὐτὰ for ταῦτα
3 φαντασίας for θεωρίας
om καὶ before ταῖς
- 14 om μὲν before κατὰ
ὀρῶ for ὀρῶν
- 9C.1 καὶ τῷ for τὸ
δυνατῶ for δυνατόν
om μεταποιεῖ
- 2-3 om τούτῳ . . ἐπιθυμίας
4 ὥσγε for ὥσπερ
τὸ καλὸν
- 6-7 read γενομένη ὥσπερ εἶπον
ἀθάνατος instead of τὴν
φύσιν . . . εὐκλήντος
- 7 τοῖνυν ἑαυτῆς τὸ αὐτεξούσιον
- 11 κακὰ for φαῦλα
- 9D.1 ταύτης before παναρμονίου
2 ἔχοντες
3 om τε
4 om τὸν before θεὸν
8 αὐτῆς
9 τούτῳ altered to τοῦτο
- 12A.4 om δεικνύουσα . . . καὶ be-
fore νομίζουσα
6 om καὶ before οὐκ εἰδυῖα
- 7-8 om ἀλλ' . . . κινεῖσθαι
8 om γὰρ
12 add ἅπαξ before σκοπήσασα
- 12B.3 add μὲν before εὐφημίας
8 κώρον altered to κόρον
10 add ἄλλῃ ἐστὶν after οὐδεμία
11 ἦ for ἀλλ'
add ἀπὸ before τῶν
12 καταφρονήσει
14 ἐὰν for ἀν
15 ἐλαύνει
- 12C.3 ὅποι for ὅπου
4 ὁ τοιούτως for ὅτι οὕτω
14 τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
- 12D.1 ἐπινοεῖ for ἐποίει
3-4 after ἐγνωκότες add ἐνόμισαν
καὶ πρὸ τῶν γενητῶν
4 om ἀπεφῆναντο
- 13A.9 γερόμενον for γινόμενον
12 αὐτοὶ for οὔτοι
φρονούσιν for παραφρονούσιν
15 τὸν κακοῦ for τοῦ κακοῦ
- 13B.2 om τε before τῶν
om θείων before γραφῶν
4 om καὶ
ταῦτα after ἀναπλασάμενοι
6 θείοις before ἑαυτοῦ
7 om θεὸς after κύριος
9 om ἔσται
10 θεὸς after παρὰ τοῦτον
12 add θεοῦ before πληροῦντος
om τοῦ before οὐρανοῦ
ὁ for καὶ before θεός
- 13C.1 τῶν for τὸν before τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ
9 ἀποβαῖνοι for ἀποβαίνει
10 om καὶ before ὁ ἀγαθός
15 om καὶ . . . εἶποι
- 13D.4 ἔργων αὐτοῦ
after ἔργων αὐτοῦ add οὐδὲ
τῶν ἀπαγγειλάντων περὶ
αὐτοῦ
5 om ὅλως
7 αὐτὰ for ταῦτα
9 τυγχάνειν ἀλλήλων for ἀλλή-
λων εἶναι
15 περιπατεῖ
- 16A.3 ἡ τῆς τοῦ φαύλου
4 αὐτὸ εἶναι
14 αὐτῷ for ἑαυτῷ before ἐπινοῇ
ἐπινοῶν for ἐπινοῇ (corr.?)
- 16B.6 om τι before ποιεῖν
13 add καὶ before αὐτοὶ
14 φαντασία for εὐρεσις
- 16C.3 κακὸν for κακὴν
6 χεῖρον

- 9 ὅτι ἀν ἀπὸ for καὶ πρὸς τὰ
 11 om ἔτι
 πλεῖον for πλεον
 om μόνα
 12 add μόνον after πρόσκαιρα
 εἶναι before καὶ
 om τὰ before καλὰ
 16D.3-4 om καὶ . . . ἀνατυπούται
 4 συμπλοκαῖς
 6 μόνον
 8 om ὁρᾷ
 17A.1 add βλέπει after προσπίπ-
 τοντα
 σαρκικῆς πάσης
 5 ἀναθείσα
 11 βλέπη
 15 μηδὲν πλεον
 17B.1 om τὰ before κύρια
 2 παραφρονούντες
 3 σαρκῶν
 4 τὰς for τῆς before περὶ
 7 ἐκθειάσαντες
 8 εἶπερ for ἤπερ
 11 τοσοῦτῳ μᾶλλον for τοσοῦτου
 12 ὅσω
 15 om ἑαυτοῖς
 16 ταῖς δεισιδαίμονίαις
 17C.2 add τοῖς before κακοῖς
 7 om καὶ after θεοῦ
 add λοιπὸν after καταβαί-
 νοντες
 11 εἶναι νομίζοντες for τυγχάνειν
 12 ἔπειτα
 14 om θεοῦς
 17D.4 om οἱ before πλεον
 7 om καὶ καταπεσόντες
 20A.1 ψυχὰς for μορφὰς
 2 add καὶ before ἔτι
 4 om δὲ after ἥδη
 add εἰς before ξύλα
 9 ὄντως for ὄντα
 10 add ἀλλ' before εἶθε
 om δὲ
 ἦν στᾶσα for εἰστήκει
 10-11 ἡ before τῶν ἀφρόνων
 12 add οἱ ἄνθρωποι after ἐνέ-
 φυρον
 20B.1 ἐπιμειζαντες
 5 μέλη for μέρη
 7 ἐνέκαστον
 20B.13 Πάφῳ for Πάρῳ (but ρ ob-
 vious misprint in Migne)
 16 αὐτοῖς for αὐτῶν
 20C.1 om εἰς before θεοῦς
 2 ἑαυτῶν
 οἷος for ὡς
 2-3 περιβόητος παρ' αὐτοῖς
 3 om ὁ before καὶ
 8 ἐμπλέω
 12 add τὸν before θάνατον
 add τὸν after μετὰ
 12-13 ἐλέγχων for ἔλεγχον
 14 οὐ καλῶς for οὐκ ἄλλως
 15 αὕτη ἡ ἐπιθυμία παρὰ τῶν
 πλασαμένων for αὕτη ἡ δι'
 ἐπιθυμίαν τῶν πλασαμένων
 20D.3 μὴ for μήτοι
 θαυμάζετε for θαυμάσης
 3-4 νομίσης stands before εἶναι
 4 σύγκλιτος for σύγκλητος
 7 ὅσους for οὓς
 κρίνουσιν
 21A.1 om ὡς before πολεμίους
 2 om τὴν φύσιν (perhaps lapse
 of memory as words be-
 gin new page)
 4 ἀνδραγαθίας for ἀνδραγαθίαν
 ὡς for ὥσπερ
 4-5 om ἐπ' ἐξουσίας
 7 om αὐτοῦς 2^ο (before εἶναι)
 11 om μὲν before ἔχει
 13 τούτους καὶ θεοῦς

- εἶναι δογματίζουσιν
 15 om αὐτοὶ before ἀποθνήσκοντες
 21c.1 om οὗτοι
 2 τίς οὖν ταύτης μᾶλλον γένοιτ' ἂν ἐναντιότητος καὶ μανίας for ὡ πολλῆς ἐναντιότητος καὶ μανίας
 add τούτους after διετάξατο
 4 ἴσθηται for εἰσθήκει
 7 om τοῦ before θεοῦ
 10 καθάπερ εἰρήκαμεν for ἃς προειρήκαμεν
 ὁ Ἰσὺς
 13 om ἐν before τοῖς πάλαι
 21d.5 καὶ τούτους οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα for οὓς οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα
 24A.1 ἀπολλομένους for ἀπολομένους γοῦν for γὰρ before χάρις
 8 Οὐρου for Ὠρου
 10 χαλκία for χαλκεῖα
 12 αἰμοβόρου for ὠμοβόρου om γενόμενον
 13 σοφὸς εἶναι δόξας Πλάτων for σοφὸς . . . Πλάτων
 15 om μετὰ Σωκράτους
 24B.1 add τοῦ before ἀνθρώπου
 3 ταῦτα for ταύτας
 4 πορνίας for πορνείας
 8 add τὸ before τέλους
 9 add ὁ before πατὴρ
 10 τε for τότε
 12 εἶτα for εἴτ' ἐν
 24c.3 add καὶ before οὓς ἐδύναντο for δυνάμενοι
 10 om τῷ before κρατοῦντι
 12 ἐφελκόμενος εὐχαρεῖ for εὐχαρί
 13-14 σέβας for σέβασμα
 14 γέγονεν for ἐγεγόνει
 24d.1 δουλεύοντες for δουλεύσαντες
 2 om τοίνυν
 3 om τῶν ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ for ἐπὶ μάρτυρι
 5 ὥρα erased to ο ρα
 6 αὐτοὶ for οὗτοι
 25A.1 om τὰ before τεκμήρια λαμβάνοντες
 3 om τῶν κάτωθεν
 4 αὐτοὺς μὴ εἶναι θεοὺς for οὐκ εἶναι αὐτοὺς θεοὺς
 5-6 οἶον γὰρ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν for οἶον γὰρ, οἶόν ἐστιν ἰδεῖν
 7 om αὐτὸν after ἔστιν
 9 δεδειότα for δεδιότα
 12 υἱοῦ for υἱός
 13 add μὲν before αὐτῷ om καὶ before μὴ add δὲ after δυνάμενον
 14 λεγομένων (space between ο and μ, perhaps an altered ω, cf. 24d.5 ο ρα)
 15 om δὴ λέγω
 25B.2 Αἰγέωνος for Αἰγαίωνος νικόμενον for νικώμενον add μὲν before ὑπὸ
 3 διὰ ταύτας for δι' αὐτάς
 5 om μὲν before κρυπτόμενον
 8 τούτους for τοῦτον θεοὺς for θεὸν add τοὺς before τοσαῦτα
 8-9 δράσαντας for δράσαντα
 9 διαβληθέντας for διαβληθέντα om οἱ before κοινοὶ
 9-10 om Ῥωμαίων
 12 om. αὐτοῦ before τὴν add τοῦ Διὸς after Σεμέλην
 13 om καὶ Ἀρτεμιν
 14 Δαναῖν for Δανάην with ἱ inked over om καὶ Ἀντιόπην

- 25C.1 ἡ τίς ἰδὼν (ἡ and ἰ inked over; may have read originally εἰ τίς εἰδὼν)
- 2 αὐτοῦ after ἐπιχείρησιν
- 5-6 om θεοποιήσας
- 6-7 ἐαυτοῦ for αὐτοῦ
- 7 om φαντασίαν
add πλάνην after κατασκευάζων
- 8 διόσκοροι
- 9 τίς ἰδὼν (σ and ι inked over)
- 10 add αὐτῶν after θεῶν
- 11 ἰδίῳ for Ἰλίῳ
- 12 δι' ἀλλήλων φιλονεικίαν for διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους φιλονεικίαν
- 16 αἰδωνέα
- 25D.4 add αὐτῶν after φύσεως
- 5 om εἶναι before θεοὺς
- 28A.4 ἰδὼν ι inked over
ἄρεως
- 7 om τοῦ before Ἑφαίστου
- 8 om καὶ before αὐτοὺς
add τε after αὐτοὺς
ἐαυτῶν
- 9 om ἂν before γελάσειεν
καταγνώσειεν
- 12 αὐτῶν after γάρ
- 28B.6-29C.1 om οὐκ αἰσχύνονται . . .
πάντες μάταια (one page has dropped out of the MS.)
- 29C.1 συναχθήτωσαν
- 3-4 καὶ στήτωσαν ἅμα καὶ αἰσχυ-
νθήτωσαν πάντες καὶ ἐντρα-
πήτωσαν for καὶ στήτωσαν
. . . αἰσχυνθήτωσαν ἅμα
- 4 τέκτον for τέκτων
- 5 om 1st καὶ
σκηπάρνῳ for σκεπάρνῳ
- 6 ἐρύθμισεν for ἐρρύθμισεν
om καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτὸ (homoioteleuton)
- 10 ἐρύθμισεν for ἐρρυθμισεν
- 12 καὶ ἔκοψεν for δ' ἔκοψεν
- 15 ἐθερμάνθη for θερμανθῇ
- 32A.1 ἐπ' αὐτῶν for ἐπ' αὐτῷ
καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν for τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν
- 2 προσκυνούσιν
αὐτῶν for αὐτοῦ
- 3-4 ὀπτήσας κρέα for κρέας ὀπτή-
σας
- 9-10 οὐκ ἐλογίσατο
- 10 om ἐν before τῇ καρδίᾳ
om αὐτοῦ after καρδίᾳ
- 10-11 ἀνελογίσατο for ἀνελογίσατο
- 14 κρέα for κρέας
- 32B.2 εἶδετε for ἔδετε
om καὶ
- 4 add ἂν before κριθεῖεν
- 6 πεποιθόσιν (ο evidently al-
tered from ω)
- 11 αἰσθανομένων
add ἂν before τῶν εἰδῶλων
- 32C.1 om τὴν before τῶν αἰσθητῶν
ἀντιλη ψιν (letter erased be-
fore ψ)
- 5 add γὰρ before γνώρισμα
- 8 om λέγω after ποιηταὶ
- 9 om αὐτοὺς before εἶναι
τῆς ἀθεότητος
- 11 ἀνεγραφον for ἀνεγραφήκεισαν
- 12 μόνον for μόνῳ
- 15 τούτων for τοῦ Διὸς
om καὶ παιδοφθορίας τῶν
ἄλλων
ζηλοτυπείας for ζηλοτυπίας
- 32D.2 om ἡ before ἐαυτοὺς
- 3 add ἡ before ὅτι οὐ μόνον
- 5 add αὐτῶν before μυθολο-
γοῦσιν

- 6 *περί* for *ἐπὶ*
 7 *καταφύγουσιν* for *καταφύ-
 ξονται*
 7-8 *om λέγοντες τῶν ποιητῶν*
 33A.1 *τέρψιν* for *ἡδονήν*
 2 *om καὶ*
 add *τῶν* before *θεῶν*
 4 *om αὐτοῖς* before *ἔωλος*
 5 *οὔτοι* for *αὐτοί*
 8 *"Αρεως* for *"Αρεος*
 9 *ὡς γὰρ αὐτοὶ φασιν* for *ἴσως*
γὰρ ὡς αὐτοὶ φασι
 14 add *θεοῦς* before *θρησκεύουσιν*
 33B.3 *om 2nd ἐψεύσαντο*
 5 *om περί τὰ ὀνόματα ἀληθεί-*
ουσι (homoioteleuton)
 7 *εἰς ἃ ἦν ἀληθῶς* for *ἴσασιν*
ἀληθῶς
 9 *προσάψουσιν* for *προσάψοιεν*
 11 *πάλιν* for *ἔμπαλιν*
 12 *ἔχει τοῦ ψυχεῖν* for *ἔχει ψυχ-*
ράν
 33B.15-C.1 *κατ' ἀλλήλους δέ ταῖς πρά-*
ξεσιν καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις καὶ
ταῖς προσηγορίαις εἶναι
χρῆ for *κατ' ἀλλήλους*
. . . χρῆ
 33C.3 add *ἡ* before *πράξις*
 4 *εἰ* for *καὶ* before *τὰς*
 5 *ἀπήγγελλεν* for *ἀπαγγέλλων*
 7 *διηγόιτο* for *διηγείτο*
λέγων γὰρ γὰρ ταῦτα for *ἀλλὰ*
καὶ λέγων
 33D.1 *γὰρ* before *μῆ*
 1-2 *τὰς ἀνδρείας* for *ἐπὶ τῆς ἀν-*
δρείας
 36A.1 *γυναικίας* for *γυναικεῖας*
 5-6 *καταψεύσασθαι* for *καταψεύ-*
δεσθαι
 6 add *ἡ* before *καὶ*
 7 *ἀσελγείαις* for *ἀσελγείας*
 8 *ὁ τὸν* for *ὅταν*
 9 *λέγουσιν* for *λέγωσι*
 10 *om τὸν* before *Δία*
accent on Διᾶ is apparently
circumflex
 12 supply *οὖν* before *ἐλέγξειεν*
κατ' αὐτῶν follows *τὸν λόγον*
 13-14 *γενήσεται* for *φανήσεται*
 36B.8 *ἀληθείας ἂν τις ἐπιγνοίη* for
ἀληθῆς . . . ἐπιγνώσεται
 9 *om καὶ* after *τινὰ*
 10 add *καὶ* before *μᾶλλον*
 36C.1 add *καὶ* before *ὥσπερ*
 5 *οὕτως* for *οὕτω*
 5-6 *παρ' αὐτοῖς* follows *θαυμαστοὶ*
 6 *λογογράφοι* for *ποιηταὶ*
 9 *ἐπισκιάζουσιν* for *ἐπισκιάσου-*
σιν
 36D.6 *φωναῖς* for *γραφαῖς*
 37A.1 *γοῦν* for *οὖν*
 3 *μικρὸ* for *μικρῷ*
 5 *om ὄντας* after *σεμνοῦς*
 12-13 *om "Αρτεμις δὲ τὴν κυνηγητι-*
κὴν
 14 add *οἱ* before *ἄλλοι*
ἀς for *ὡς*
 37B.2 *εἰς ἣν* changed from original
εἴσιν (?)
 4 *πάλοι οἱ λέγουσιν* for *οἱ πολ-*
λοι λέγουσι
 9 *om γὰρ* before *ἄνθρωποι*
 10 *δεκτικοὶ* after *ἐπιστήμης*
 15 *οῖα* for *ὥρα* (apparently the
first part of an original
ω erased)
 37C.2 *ὀνομασίας* follows *ἡξιώθησαν*
 3 *om γὰρ* before *ἐφεύρον*
 6 *'Αριστέος* for *'Αρισταῖος*
 7 *Τριπόλεμος* for *Τριπτόλεμος*
 9 *σύστασιν* for *σύνταξιν*
 37D.2 *ἀκολουθεῖ* for *ἀκόλουθον*

- 4 οὗς for ὡς
 40A.1 αὐτοῖς ἄλλην
 6 om ἡ before φύσις
 7 add τὴν before ἀλογίαν
 14 om ἐν before τοῖς
 40B.7 ὥσπερ εἶπον for ὡς προεῖπον
 8 κατέπεσαν for κατέπεσον
 12 om καὶ ἐπιστήμονες
 add πάλιν before ἐλεγχόμενοι
 13 add τῶν before ἀνθρώπων
 15 διὰ τοῦθ' αὐτοὺς
 40B.15-C.1 αὐτῶν for τούτων after διὰ
 40C.2 φάνηται
 4 δῆθεν ἀκριβέστερον καὶ βαθύτε-
 ρον for φιλοσοφώτεροι καὶ
 βαθύτερα
 5 om ταῦτα after τοῦτο
 6 ἐπιφάνειαν, εἰ inked over
 8 γνωρίζωσιν, ω inked over
 10 γινώσκει for γινώσκειν
 12 ἐπιφανίας for ἐπιφανείας
 14 ἐξετάσει for ἐξετάσῃ
 ἐπιμελίας for ἐπιμελείας
 τὸν λόγον follows ἐπιμελείας
 15 προτέρων for πρότερον
 40D.2-3 om εἶποι . . . κρινούσῃ
 3 add γὰρ after πῶς
 4 add λεγέτωσαν before πότε-
 ρον
 41A.2-3 περιτείχισαν for περιτετει-
 χίσθαι
 3 add καὶ before συγκλείοντες
 8 add αἱ before μορφαί
 om τὰ before γλύμματα
 9 κάλλιον for καλλίων
 om τοῦ before θεοῦ
 10 αὐτῶν for αὐτὸν before λόγον
 om ζώων
 12 προσεδοκάτω for προσεδοκάτο
 14 τετράποδα?
 41B.3 add πάλιν before μάλλον
 αὐτὰ follows μάλλον
 ζῶα for ζῶντα
 3-4 τὰς τούτων εἰκόνας for τοὺς
 τούτων τύπους
 5 om ἡ before μορφή
 om ἡ before ὕλη
 6 add τοῦ before θεοῦ
 9 ταῖς γλύμμασιν for τοῖς γλύμ-
 μασι
 14 προσκυνῆσθαι for προσκυνεῖ-
 σθαι
 41C.2 ἂν τις follows ἀκολουθῶς
 add οὖν after εἰ
 3 δι' αὐτὴν τὴν for διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ
 8 καταλήψεως one letter erased
 between η and ψ
 γλύψαντες for γλύφοντες
 10 γλίμμασιν
 12 μικρότητος for σμικρότητος
 13 αὐτὸν for τολμῶντες
 om δι' αὐτῶν
 13-14 ἀλλὰ τὰς ἐλάττους for τὰς δὲ
 ἐλάττω
 14 δι' αὐτῶν ἐπικαλούμενοι for
 ἐπικαλεῖσθαι
 διὰ τί for αὐτοὶ
 16 τοῖς ξύλοις καὶ τοῖς λίθοις
 19 ἐστὶν for εἰσιν
 41D.4-44B.5 om οὐ δίκαιον . . . ἀξι-
 ῶν μαθεῖν and read ποῖον
 σύμβολον ἐν τούτοις τῆς
 περὶ θεοῦ νοήσεως τί ὅμοιον
 ἀνθρώπου ἢ τετράποδον καὶ
 ἔρπετον τῆς περὶ θεοῦ
 σημασίας· ἐν μὲν οὖν
 χάριτι γραφόμενον τὸ βα-
 σιλέως ὄνομα θεωρήσας τίς
 οἶδεν ὅτι περὶ βασιλέως
 ἤκουσεν· ἀνθρώπου δὲ μορ-
 φὴν τίς· ἢ ἀλόγων ζώων

- θεωρήσας ποῖον ἔξει σύμβολον ἢ γνώρισμα τῆς περὶ θεοῦ γνώσεως· ἵνα καὶ τὰς τούτων ἐν λίθοις εἰκόνας εἴπητε ταῦτα εἶναι γράμματα τῆς περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐννοίας· ἐβουλόμην δὲ ἰδεῖν· εἰ βουλόμενοι γράψαι καὶ εἰκόνα στήσαι βασιλέως ἐγράφετε τετράποδα ἢ ἐρπετά· καὶ οὐ πάντα μάλλον· εἰ τοῦτ' ἐπιχειρεῖται διὰ τὸν ἐκ τούτου κίνδυνον· εἰ δὲ ἂ μὴ περὶ ἀνθρώπων τολμᾶτε ποιεῖν ταῦτα περὶ θεοῦ ἐπιτηδεύετε πλάττειν· πῶς οὐ πάσης ἄξια καταγνώσεως τὰ παρ' ὑμῖν· καὶ γὰρ πάλιν ἄξιον ὑμᾶς ἐρέσθαι καὶ ἀκοῦσαι παρ' ὑμῶν τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τοιαύτης τῶν εἰδώλων ὑμῶν μορφῆς.¹⁸
- 44B.7 περιτίθεται for περιτιθέασι
8 περιτίθετε γλυφάς
10 κατειλήφατε for κατειλήφασι
12 ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀλόγων
13 γλύφετε for γλύφουσιν
om τὰ after ὁποῖα
14 μοίθοις (sic)
om ἡ before Σκύλλα
- 44C.5 περιτιθέατε for περιτιθέασι
7 ψεύδεσθαι for ψεύδονται
11 om αὐτῶν
add ὑμῶν after δεισιδαιμονίας
12 ὑπολαμβάνετε for ὑπολαμβάνουσιν
15 πλάττειν for ἀναπλάττειν
- 44D.1 ὁρᾶτε for ὄρα
3 ἐπινοεῖν for ὑπονοεῖν
om τοῦ
θεοῦ for θείου
4 τῷ τοιούτῳ for αὐτῷ
5 add τὰ before τοῦ σώματος
6 om καὶ τέμνεσθαι
7 om πάλιν
9 οὐ δεόμενος for οὐδενὸς εἰς
ὅτι οὖν δεόμενος
- 45A.1 οὖν for γὰρ
ἀνανεομένους for ἀνακαινού-
μένους
4 ἀφ' ὧν for ἐφ' ᾧ
καταγοίη for καταγνώσῃται
5 om ὅτι
add γὰρ after ὧν
10 ἀναπληροῦσθαι
12 οὐ καίσχυνονται (erasure after ου, and κ inked over)
15 οὗτοι for αὐτοὶ
- 45B.2 om ἂν before αὐτῶν
4 διαστάξῃ for διαστάξῃ
15 Ἀθηναίοις for Θηβαίοις
οὐδὲ for οὐ before γινώσκουσι
- 45C.1 Ἀραβίων for Ἀράβων
om καὶ after Ἀραβίων
Ἀράβιοι for Ἀραβες
4 νομίζουσι for ὀνομάζουσι
5 ἄλλους for ἐτέρους
6 om δεῖ
10 προσκυνεῖ for προσκρίνει
11 εἶναι after τούτους
14 ἀλλήλων for ἀλλήλαις
17 κορκόδιλος (sic)
- 45D.1 om ὡς θεὸς after λέων
48A.2 ἄλλων for ἐν ἄλλῳ
ἀλθεται for ἀλίσκεται
5 ὅσοι for ὡς οἱ

¹⁸ The punctuation of the manuscript has been followed, but not its frequent omissions of accents and breathings.

- 9 om ἰθὺν
 14 ἀληθινόν for ἀληθῶς
 48B.7 μηκέτι for μὴ before ὁρῶντες
 48B.9-10 om ἀληθῶς before ἀθεότητος
 48C.1 γούν for δὲ after Αἰγύπτιοι
 om τὸν before βούν
 2 om ὄντα
 3-4 θύουσιν for θύσωσιν
 4 add γε after ὁμοία
 5 ὄν for ὅ
 8 ἄλλοι for τοῖς ἄλλοις
 9 ἐτέροις for ἕτεροι
 11 μᾶλλον for μάλιστα
 15 ἀκριβείας for ἀτιμίας
 καὶ σχεδὸν for σχεδὸν δὲ
 48D.1 οὐσία for θυσία
 om ἂν after ὥστε
 49A.1-2 om ἄλλων ἔτι τε καὶ
 2 ἀποτροπάσματα
 5 ἐξηνέχθησαν for ἐξενέχθησαν
 7 add εἰς before θυσίας
 9 ἐστί for εἰσι after ἀρχέτυπα
 9-10 om θεῶν . . . ἀνθρώπους
 13 Ταῦροι for Ταύρειοι
 49B.3 om οὕτως ἐλέγχοντες
 4 ἐαυτῶν for αὐτῶν
 5 ὁμότητα for ὁμότητα
 49.20 κατασφάζουσιν for κατασφάτ-
 τουσι
 21 add καὶ before κατὰ
 26 κατασφάζουσιν for κατα-
 σφάττουσιν
 27 om ἂν before κατὰ
 28 add οὐδὲ before διὰ τὴν
 29 om τὰ after ἀγριότητα
 τσαῦτα for τὰ τοιαῦτα
 μυσερά for μυσαρά
 30-31 μύσος for δρῆμα
 31 μὲν precedes ἔθνον
 32 τοιαύτας σφαγίας
 33-34 om καὶ οἱ before πάλαι
 35 Δι' ἀνθρωποθυσίας for Δία ἀν-
 θρωποθυσίαις
 36 om 2nd ἐμιαίνοντο
 39 om τὰ before κακὰ
 44 ἀνδροφόνοι for ἀνδροφονίαις
 44-45 τεκνοκτόνοι for τεκνοτονίαις
 46 om γὰρ before σχεδὸν
 48 γιγνομένης for γινομένη
 49 ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ
 52.1 εἰδωλοῖς for εἰδωλείοις
 3 om ἐαυτῶν before τὴν
 4 τὴν πορνίαν for τῇ πορνείᾳ
 μιμῆσθαι for ἱλάσκεσθαι
 9 om λεγομένων
 10 αἰσχίστως for αἰσχίστοις
 11 θεοῦ for Χριστοῦ
 16 ὀρέξῃ for ὀρέξει
 17 ἄρρεσιν for ἄρρεσι
 22 πορνίαν for πορνείαν
 23 ἄρεως for Ἄρεος
 26 om εἶναι
 28 om τούτους
 30 ἀλόγους for ἀλόγων
 om ἀλογωτέρους
 33 θεὸν follows ἡρνοῦντο
 add τὸν before τοῦ Χριστοῦ
 34-35 om οἱ ἐπαναβεβηκότες . . .
 ἐπτοημένοι
 36 γλυμμάτων for βδελυγμάτων
 36-38 om εὐκατάγνωστα . . . καὶ
 αὐτοὶ
 38 om δὲ before αὐτοῖς
 39 τὴν κτίσιν for τὸν κόσμον
 40 θρησκεία for θρησκείαν
 45 τὴν before σύμπασαν
 53.1 ὑπερῆρεν for ὑπεραίρει
 om φύσιν
 2 om τῆς before γῆς
 3-4 ὁ λόγος follows τοῖς
 4 εὐρήσῃ for εὐρήσει
 7 add καὶ before αὐτῆς

- add τῶν πάντων before θεόν
 8 om τὸν καὶ . . . βασιλεύ-
 οντα τὸν
 9 add καὶ before πατέρα
 10 δοκησείσοφοι for δοκησισόφοι
 13 αὐτῶν for αὐτὴν
 15 δυσωπήσει for δυσωπήσῃ
 μὲν for ἂν before καλῶς
 25 om καὶ . . . οἶον
 add μὲν after ἥλιον
 26 om καὶ before γῆν
 add τε after γῆν
 28 διαιρῶν for διελῶν
 30 πάντως for πάντα
 33 συμπεριστρέφεται (περι above
 line) for συμπεριφέρεται
 38 οὐδὲ for οἱ δὲ
 40 συ . . στή for συσταίῃ (era-
 sure)
 44 οὐχ ὑφ' for οὐκ ἀφ'
 45 ἐρήρισται for ἐρήρεισται
 46 om καὶ αὕτη
 56.2 ὅπου for ὅποι
 3 προσρηξῇ for προσρήσῃ
 4 om κατὰ . . . εἰπόντας
 5 ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ἀέρος πρὸς τὸν αἰ-
 θέρα for ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὸν
 ἀέρα τοῦ αἰθέρος
 6-7 διὰ τοῦτο for δι' αὐτοῦ
 8 om καὶ before συνέστηκεν
 11 ὁρᾶν for εἰδέναι
 ὥς for ὅτι
 12 συνίσταται for συνίστανται
 14 add δὲ after ταῦτα
 16 τὸ ὕγρον for τοῦτο
 19 τινα for τι
 προσῆκεν for προσῆκει
 20 αὐτοῖς for ἑαυτὰ
 21 ἐπιδεᾷ for ἐπιδεῇ
 22 πλήρης for πλήρη
 αὐτοῦ for ἑαυτοῦ
 συστήκει for συστήκειν (era-
 sure between συ στήκει)
 25 om τὰ before λειπόμενα
 29 add τὰ before πάντα
 30 μετὰ σώματος for μέγα σῶμα
 om τὸ before ὅλον
 31 erasure between συ στάντος
 32 αὐτῷ for ἑαυτῷ
 33 πρὸ πάντων for πρὸς πάντα
 33-34 οἱ φιλονεικούντες οἱ σοφοὶ for
 οἱ δοκησισόφοι
 34-36 om οὗτος . . . ἀποδείξει
 37 om τὸ before καθ'
 om τὸ before ὅλον
 39 ἕκαστα for ἕκαστον
 μέρη for μέρος
 40 add ἀλλὰ καὶ before τοῦτο
 om δὲ after τοῦτο
 41 συνέστηκεν for καθέστηκεν
 43 πόσῃν for ὅσῃν
 44 ἀσεβοῦσιν for ἐξηγοῦνται
 46-47 πλήρωσιν for συμπλήρωσιν
 οὐ for εἰ
 add ταυτὸν before ἥλιος
 om οὐκ ἔστι before σελήνῃ
 47-50 om καὶ . . . λόγου and add
 οὐδὲ σελήνῃ καὶ γῇ οὐδὲ
 γῇ καὶ θάλαττα
 57.1 ἀνθρωπίνου for ἀνθρωπείου
 2 om ὁ before ὀφθαλμὸς
 2-3 οὐκ precedes ὀφθαλμὸς
 5 ἑκάστου for ἐκ
 7 ἔχοντα
 11 ἥ for εἰ
 12 τὸν τοιοῦτον for αὐτὸν
 20 om τῇ before χειρὶ
 21 om ὁ before περὶ
 22 αὐτὸν follows εἶναι
 μηδένα
 27 σκοτίζει for σκιάζει
 om ὁ before ἥλιος

- 28 om καὶ before γῆς
 30 ὕδατος for ὑδάτων
 31 add τὸ before ἔαρ
 33 μεθοπώρου for μετοπώρου
 37 ἐπιτελεῖν for ἀποτελεῖν
 38 ὅμου precedes ἥλιον
 ἄστρων for ἀστέρων
 40 κατανάσθαι (sic)
 41 add τὸν before χειμῶνα
 μεθόπορον
 42 om τὴν before θάλασσαν
 43-44 τὸ πόμα follows κοινὸν
 44 add τοῖς before ἀνθρώποις
 46 add ὅμου after κοινὴν
 46-47 ἀνθρώποις follows χρεῖαν
 50 γενέσθαι for γίνεσθαι
 60.4 ἀσύμφωνον follows φύσιν
 5 παράσχοιεν for παρέχοιεν
 6 γένοιτο πρυτάνης for γένοντο
 πρυτάνεις
 8 πολὺ for πολλῶ
 10 μυθολογούμενοι for μυθεύμε-
 νοι
 εἶναι for εἶεν
 14 θεοπλασία for θεοποιία
 19 δείκνυται for δέδεικται
 20 εἰδωλολατρία
 24 ἡγημόνα corrected to ἡγε-
 μόνα
 26 om καὶ before τὸν
 om τούτου before πατέρα
 27 add οἱ before Ἑλληνες
 30 διελέγχθη
 32 ἀπλανῇ for ἀκριβῇ
 32-33 ἡμῖν precedes ἐστιν
 33 οὐχ for οὐδ'
 38 om σου before ἐστιν
 add δι' αὐτοῦ before ὁ σωτὴρ
 42 add τὸν before τοῦ πατρός
 61.1-2 om ἐκβαίνοντες
 2 αὐτὰς (?) corrected to αὐτοὺς
 5 γινώσκεισθαι for θεωρεῖσθαι
 7 add τινες after ψυχὴν
 τῶν ἀσεβῶν for οἱ ἀσεβεῖς
 9 αὐτοῦ for τούτου
 10 ψυχὴν precedes ἕκαστος
 11-12 καὶ τοῦτο follows ἐστι
 12 ἐπειδὴ for ἐπεὶ
 21 ἄλογα καλεῖν
 24 αὐτοῦ for αὐτοῦ
 26 ἐρεῖσθαι for αἰρεῖσθαι
 29 om οὐ . . . ἀλλὰ
 35 ἀλόγων for ἄλλος ὢν
 39 ὀφθαλμῶν for ὀφθαλμοῦ
 om ἐστι before μόνον
 om τὸ before ὁρᾶν
 add μόνον after ὧτων
 om τὸ before ἀκοῦειν
 40 om τὸ before γεύσασθαι
 γεύσασθαι for γεένεσθαι
 41 om τὸ before ἀπτεσθαι
 44 add τῆς before ψυχῆς
 64.2-3 νευρῶν for νευραὶ
 3 ἐκάστη for ἕκασται
 ἔχει for ἔχουσι
 5 αὐτῶν precedes ἐστιν
 9 μετ' ἐπιστήμης for ἀρμοδίας
 10 ὡς λύρας precedes ἐν τῷ
 σώματι
 12 ἴδιον follows ἀνθρώπων
 15 add ἐν before ᾧ
 om χρωμένῃ
 16 ἀληθῶς precedes ὅτι
 ἄλλα for ἄλλη
 τὰ φαινόμενα for τὸ φαινό-
 μενον
 16-17 ἐστιν follows σώματι
 17 γοῦν follows πολλάκις
 κινουμένου (following σώμα-
 τος) for κειμένου
 19-20 ἡσυχάζοντος καὶ ἡρεμούντος
 20 κινεῖται follows ἀνθρώπος

- ἐνδοθεν for ἐνδον
 21 after ἄνθρωπος κινεῖται add
 καὶ τῷ μὲν θυμοῦται (final
 ai written over erasure)
 πρὸς ἄλλον δὲ λυπεῖται·
 καὶ ἄλλων μὲν ὀρέγεται·
 ἔστιν δ' ὅτε τὰ βέλτιστα
 διαλογίζεται καὶ φρονεῖ
 τοῦ σώματος for ἑαυτοῦ
 21-24 om χώρας . . . προγινώσκων
 25-26 om ἐν ᾗ . . . ἄνθρωπος
 27 add καὶ γὰρ before καὶ τοῦτο
 πάλιν for δ'
 28 τετρωμένοις for τετραμμένοις
 35 ἑαυτῷ for ἑαυτὸ
 λογίζεται for λογιῖσται
 35-36 καὶ οὐκ . . . λογίζεται fol-
 lows πρόσκαιρόν ἐστιν
 37 τὸν for τὸ
 41 om ὡς . . . λύρα
 41-46 om πῶς . . . ἢ τίς and add
 καὶ τὴν μὲν κατὰ φύσιν
 οὔσαν ἀκουστικὴν ἀπο-
 κλείει τοῦ ἀκούειν
 46 add δὲ before γεύσιν
 48 αὕτη καὶ for τίς δὲ
 65.2-5 om τίς ὁ ταῦτα . . . ἡνιο-
 χεῖται
 8 κινεῖν for ἐλαύνειν
 10 om γοῦν
 11 om τὰ before καλὰ
 12 om τὰ before κακὰ
 22 παραλλάττειν for διαλλάττειν
 26-27 om καὶ οὐχὶ . . . κινεῖται
 29 ὑφ' for ἀφ'
 32 ἐκινεῖτο corrected to ἐκινεῖτο
 32-33 ἀποθνήσκοντος for ἀναχω-
 ρούντος
 33 συναποθνήσκειν for ἀποθνήσ-
 κειν
 add καὶ before αὐτήν
 ἡ παρουσία τῆς ψυχῆς for ἡ
 ψυχὴ
 34 om κινεῖ
 om καὶ before τὸ σῶμα
 add ζῇ after σῶμα
 add πᾶσα after ἀνάγκη
 34-35 om μᾶλλον . . . ἀνάγκης καὶ
 36 ζῇν for ζῇ
 add αὐτήν after ζῇν
 36-41 om ἡ γὰρ . . . τις ἴδοι
 41 add καὶ πάλιν before εἰ
 om γὰρ before καὶ
 41-42 τῷ σώματι for τὸ σῶμα
 42 om ἐπιβέβηκε καὶ
 om τοῦτω
 43 μικρότητα for σμικρότητα
 45 om μὴ . . . θανάτω
 48 add καὶ before μένουσα
 49 γοῦν for δὲ
 ἔξωθεν for ἔξω
 50 om καὶ ἀγγέλοις
 68.1 θεωρία for θαρροῦσα
 2 om καθαρότητι
 πολὺ for πολλῷ
 4 ἔξη for ἔξει
 5-6 om εἰ γὰρ . . . πλέον
 9 γοῦν for γὰρ
 10 ἐπὶ for ἐπειδὴ (sic)
 16 ἀφίουσιν for ἀφίᾳσι
 17 om ἐν before αὐτῇ
 17-18 ἀθανάτου ζωῆς for ἀθανασίας
 18 ὅθεν for διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν
 19 add ἡ after αὐτή
 20 om καὶ κατάληψιν
 21 εἰ μὲν for λέγομεν
 23 om τὴν before ψυχὴν
 23-24 νομίζουνσιν for νομίζοντες
 33 αὐτοὶ for αὐτοῖς
 41 ὡς for ἔως
 43 ὡς for ὥσπερ
 44 om καὶ before γεγόνασιν

- 45-53 om κατ' εἰκόνα . . . τὸν
λόγον
69.1 om εἰκὼν . . . ἡ and add
λόγος ὁ κύριος καὶ σωτὴρ
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός
2 add δὲ after εἰ
5 om τοῦ before θεοῦ
9 ὦν for οὖν
12 ἐννοίας for οὐσίας
13 ἀστοχεῖν for ἀτυχεῖν
16 διὰ τοῦ for τῷ
λόγου for λόγῳ
19-31 om καὶ οἶδν τι . . . γινώσκεσ-
θαι (homoioteleuton?)
32 παρὰ for ἀπὸ
33 om ὁ before Παῦλος
om μὲν
ὅτι for οὕτω
34 erasure after αὐτοῦ
36-37 ὑμῖν precedes ἐσμεν
42 om γε
43 ὑμῖν for ἡμῖν
72.1 ὁρῶν erasure between ὁ ρῶν
8 μεθ' for καθ'
9 φθείνουσαν for φθίνουσαν
14 εἰδῶν for ἰδῶν
15 κεκρασμένον for κεκραμμένον
17 om ὡς
18 εἰδῶν for ἰδῶν
χειμόνα for χειμῶνα
19 ἔαρι for ἀέρι
θέρη for θέρει
19-20 μεθοπώρῳ for μετοπώρῳ
20 om ταῦτα
21 φθείνει for φθίνει
23 ἔννοιαν λάβοι for ἐννοήσειεν
24 πᾶσιν precedes παρέχων
27 δεδεμένην for δεθείσαν
30 δρασθείσαν for ἐδρασθείσαν
(ἐ added above the line)
32 add ἓνα before εἶναι
θεὸν for τινα
ταῦτα for ταύτην
33 om θεόν
37 γιγνόμενα for γινόμενα
38 ὁμοίως for ὁμοίαν
40 διακοσμησαμένη for διακοσμή-
σασα
41 φαίνεται for δοκῇ.
om μένουσα
δι' ἣν for αὐτὰ
om μὲν γὰρ
add τὰ before καθ' ἑαυτὰ
41-42 om οὐκ ἂν . . . δυνηθείη and
add μηδέποτε συνελθόντα
καὶ συναφθέντα
43 after ἐναντιότητα add ὁμως
συνάπτεται
after ὕδωρ add ὥσπερ εἴρηται
44 νεῖον for ρέον
45-47 om τῶν ἐλαφρῶν . . . καὶ
πάλιν
48 om ἐστὶ after βαρυτάτῃ
49 om ὁμως
add μὲν after ὑπὸ
νεφελῶν for τῶν ἐλαφροτέρων
τὸ βαρύτερον
50-51 om καὶ . . . γῇ and add
αὐτὸ δὲ τῆς συμπάσης γῆς
ἔρισμα καὶ θεμέλιος γίγνε-
ται
51 τῇ θηλείᾳ for τῷ θήλει
73.3 φράσαι for φάναι
τὸ θερμὸν τῷ ψυχρῷ
om ἐστὶ
5 συστασιάζει for οὐ στασιάζει
ὁμμοινοῖς (sic) corrected in
margin to ὁμοινοῖας
11 σκοπῶν for σκοποῦν
13 ἔχει for ἔχουσι
13-15 om φύσει . . . φιλιάζοντα
15 γηγόνει (originally γέγονε?)

- 16-20 om τὸ βαρὺ . . . νεφέλαις
 20 add ταῦτα after ἐμίγη
 20-21 om ἀνομοίου . . . φύσεως
 22 ἐαυτὰ for αὐτὰ
 24 om ἄνω
 26 ἐστασίασεν for ἐστασίασαν
 28 add μὲν before νύξ
 om δὲ after νύξ
 29 om ἄν
 30 om δὲ
 32 μέτρον for μέτρα
 33 μάχη καὶ στάσει
 34 ἀνῃρείτο for ἀνῃροῦντο
 36 λειπόμενον καὶ γιγνόμενον for
 γενόμενον καὶ λειπόμενον
 37 εἰ follows καὶ
 38 add ἥ before καὶ μόνη
 39 οὖν for γὰρ
 ἐφαίνετο for ἔφαινε
 40 εἰ for ἥ before σελήνη
 εἰ for ἥ before νύξ (rewritten
 over ἥ?)
 41 εἰ for ἥ before ἡμέρα (rewrit-
 ten ἥ?)
 αἰεὶ rewritten (over εἰ?)
 42 om ὁ before οὐρανὸς
 43 om τοῦ before οὐρανοῦ
 44 add ἥ before γῆ
 add τῶν before τῆς
 45 ἐκινεῖτο for ἔκειτο
 46 add τῆς before γῆς
 76.1 καὶ for ἀλλ'
 4 om οὕτω . . . συνέστηκεν
 9 συνάγοντος
 10 ἐαυτὰ for αὐτὰ
 add εἰ before μὴ
 12 ἔξεστιν for ἐστι
 τῶν for τὸν before τούτων
 13 om καὶ before βασιλέα
 14 add καὶ before μικρῶν
 16 νεοτέρων for νεωτέρων
 16-17 θηλείων for θηλέων
 18 μένοντας for μὲν ὄντας
 22 ἰσομυρίαν
 23 add ἐννομος before παρουσία
 25-32 om ἡ μὲν . . . βλέπουμεν
 αὐτήν
 34 νοεῖν follows ἀνάγκη
 35-36 om καὶ ἡ τάξις . . . οὐ
 πολλοὺς
 37 om λόγον
 41 om τὴν before ἐαυτοῦ
 44 add δεῖν after εἶναι
 45 τῶν ἐτέρων for τοῦ ἐτέρου
 48 add ἡ before δμόνοια
 77.1 τι for τις
 ἀκούει for ἀκούει
 3 τὴν συμφωνίαν for τῆς συμφω-
 νίας
 3-6 om ὅτι μὴ . . . συνηχοῦσι·
 καὶ
 6 add γὰρ after πάντως
 ταύτης for τούτων
 7 add αὐτήν before ἐαυτήν
 κινεῖν
 8 τὸν ἐπιστήμονα for μουσικὸν
 ἐκάστην for ἐκάστης
 νευράν for νευρᾶς
 add ψάλλοντα after νευράν
 9-10 om ἥχον . . . ἐπιστήμη
 11 οὔσης follows τάξεως
 add τῷ before παντὶ
 μὴ for μήτε
 15 om πάσης
 17-21 om οὐδὲ γὰρ . . . γνώρισμα
 γὰρ and add καὶ γὰρ καὶ
 τοῦτο πάλιν
 22 εἶναι precedes, ἔνα follows,
 τὸν ποιητὴν
 om τοῦτο
 23 add πάλιν before εἴπερ
 24 πολλοὶ follows θεοὶ

- 25 ἐπεὶ μὴ for οὔτε γὰρ
 26 μήτε for οὔτε
 29 om ὅτι . . . ἀπετελέσθη
 33 ἑλληπὲς for ἑλλειπὲς
 ἄσεβες precedes οὐ μόνου
 41 add ἕκαστος before ὑπονοηθῇ
 42 ἐν θεοῖς follows λέγειν
 48 om δὲ after τοῦτο
 80.1-3 om καὶ ἀνομοίους . . . τὰς
 κινήσεις (homoioteleu-
 ton)
 6 πλεύσεται for πλεύσεται
 9 om πλήττων εἶη τεχνίτης and
 add εἶη κατ' ἐπιστήμην
 ψάλλων
 10 add τοῦ before κόσμου
 14 om τῶν before πολλῶν
 17 οὐκ ἐπειδὴ for οὐχ ὅτι
 om καὶ after τοῦτο
 18 add ποιῆσαι before κόσμους
 19-21 om ἀλλ' ὅτι . . . πιστεύειν
 εἶναι and add ἀλλὰ διὰ
 τοῦθ' ἕνα κόσμον πεποίη-
 κεν. ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα
 καὶ γνώρισμα πᾶσιν πα-
 ρέχῃ ἕνα εἶναι τὸν τοῦτον
 δημιουργήσαντα θεόν
 22 om καὶ before τοῦτο
 24 ὑπολάβοι
 26 περὶ τούτου follows διάνοιαν
 28 ψευδοθέους for first θεούς
 om καὶ before τοὺς
 29 add τε after τοὺς
 32-33 θεοσέβειαν for εὐσεβῇ θρησ-
 κείαν
 33 om καὶ before and add τε
 after τὸν
 34 ἀληθινὸν for ἀληθῇ
 36 om ἀλλ' before ἥ
 39 τουτέστιν for καὶ
 40 om καὶ before σωτήρι
 41 κυβερνᾷ for διακυβερνᾷ
 42 δοκεῖ for δοκῇ
 45 om ἦν before ἥ
 47 om καὶ ἐπιστήμη
 om καὶ before παντὶ
 47-48 τὸν πάντα κόσμον διακεκοσ-
 μῆσθαι for παντὶ κόσμῳ
 διακεκόσμηται
 81.1 οὐκ, corrected to οὐχ, for οὐ
 add ὃν after οὐ
 1-3 om τὸν ἐν . . . δὴ καὶ
 4-6 om ἀλλὰ . . . ἐπιστήμην
 12 ὅς τε δὲ corrected to ὥστε δὲ
 but in margin δὲ τότε
 13 αὐτοῦ for ἑαυτοῦ
 14-16 τὰ πάντα διεκόσμησεν καὶ
 ἡρμώσεν for τὴν τῶν . . .
 ἁρμονίαν
 16 add γὰρ after οὗτος
 18 om ἀναρτήσας . . . κειμένην
 20-22 om μεμετρημένον . . . κρε-
 μᾶται and add φθίνονσα
 πληροῦται
 24 om καὶ before κομᾷ
 26 μαίνεται for μαίνοιτο
 28 θεοῦ follows σοφία
 29 γηγόνει for ἐγεγόνει
 30 om τῷ before θεῷ
 31 om τῶν before ἀνθρώπων
 32 ὡς προεῖπον for ὥσπερ εἶπον
 33 ἐστιν precedes εἰκῶν
 35 συγκείμενοι for γενόμενοι
 37-38 om διὸ . . . σύνθετος, but
 added in margin by
 later hand
 38 om καὶ before μονογενῆς
 ὅς for ὁ
 39 om καὶ before ἐκ
 om τὰ before πάντα

- 40-41 ὅλως for ὁ λόγος
 46 τυγχανούσα
 49 τῷ for τὸ before εἶναι
 τι for τινι (but τι φθονεῖ re-
 written by same hand)
 84.2 γὰρ for οὖν
 πᾶσαν precedes τὴν
 4 πάθῃ for πάθωσιν
 8 add καὶ after μὴ
 8-9 τὸ μὴ εἶναι (η added above
 line, εἰ rewritten)
 9-10 om καὶ . . . θεῶ
 11 παρουσίᾳ for ἡγεμονίᾳ
 om καὶ προνοίᾳ
 12 κοσμήσει for διακοσμήσει
 13 ὄντος precedes ὄντως
 15-16 ἂν follows ἔπαθεν
 17 add γὰρ after ἐστίν
 18 ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ
 20 add οἱ before τῆς ἀληθείας
 21 οὖν for γοῦν
 22 om ὁ before τοῦ πατρὸς
 26 om καὶ before διὰ
 28-42 om τὰς τε ἀρχὰς . . . ὥς
 προείρηται
 42 καθὲν for καθέκαστον
 43 διατρίβω
 44 γιγνομένων for γινομένων
 47 ἦν ὁ λόγος (ἦν rewritten over
 erasure)
 before πάντα add οὗτος ἦν
 ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν
 48 οὐδὲν
 84.48-85.6 om οἷον γὰρ . . . καὶ
 θελήματι
 85.6 add αὐτὸς γὰρ before ἔνα
 8 μένων μὲν αὐτὸς ἀκίνητος
 9-10 στάσει for συστάσει
 10 ἐκάστῳ (corrected from ἐκά-
 στο [sic]) for ἕκαστον
- 10-11 καὶ τοῦτο ἐστίν αὐτοῦ τὸ
 παράδοξον τῆς θεότητος
 for τὸ γὰρ . . . ἐστίν
 12 αὐτῶν for αὐτῷ
 add τὰ before πάντα
 15 om τὰ ὑγρά, τὰ ψυχρά
 17-42 om ὁμοῦ γὰρ . . . καὶ βασι-
 λέως and add ὥς γέγονεν
 δι' αὐτοῦ (cf. 85.21 ἀπο-
 τελεῖται δι' αὐτοῦ)· καὶ
 τοῦτο πάλιν οὐκ ἄπιστον·
 ὅπου γε καὶ μεγάλη πόλις
 ὑπὸ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ καὶ
 ταύτην οἰκοδομήσαντος ἄρ-
 χοντος τοιαύτην ἔχει τὴν
 ἐπιμέλειαν· (cf. 85.39-41
 ἢ ἵνα . . . βασιλέως)
 42 add καθάπερ τοίνυν before
 ἐκείνου
 om γὰρ after ἐκείνου
 43 om καὶ προστάττοντας
 πάντας for πάντα
 44 after πάντες add τὴν ἐαυτῶν
 τάξιν ἀποτελοῦσιν· καὶ
 46 om ἄλλος . . . προέρχεται
 47-48 om ἐπὶ τὴν . . . ὁ μὲν
 48 after δικάζειν add προέρχε-
 ται
 48-49 om ὁ δὲ ἀρχων . . . θεσμο-
 θετεῖν
 51-54 om ὁ τέκτων . . . ἀνέρχεται
 88.3 γίνεται for γίγονται
 add τε after γίνεται
 συνίσταται
 6 ἐνὸς for τινος
 τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ for τοῦ
 θεοῦ λόγου
 διακοσμεῖ/ται end of p. 340.
 P. 341 begins in De In-
 carnatione at Robert-
 son, p. 6. 4.

De Incarnatione

The collation is made with Robertson's edition (1893), and the numbers refer to his pages.

- 6.5-6 μένειν for διαμένειν
 13 ἐκείνου for ἐκείνω
 20 om ὁ θεός
 21 ἐποίησεν for πεποίηκε
 7.1 om τὴν
 7-8 om ὄντα δὲ . . . γεγόνασι
 11 θνητὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος
 13 τὸν θεὸν for αὐτὸν
 om ἂν
 14 ἔμενεν
 15 add δὲ after προσοχή
 νόμου for νόμων
 17 σημαίνει τοῦτο
 19 ἀποθνήσκειται corrected to
 ἀποθνήσκειτε
 24 om συμβουλία τοῦ διαβόλου
 28 τὸ for τοῦ (cf. 10.1)
 ἐκφεύγοντες
 8.2 ιδιότητος for αἰδιότητος
 3 add ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν before
 φθόνῳ
 5 κατ' αὐτῶν λοιπὸν
 7 ἔσω for ὅσω
 θεοῦ for θείου
 9 om καὶ before ἐν
 11 ἄμετρα
 13 προσκαλεσάμενοι
 15 add ἐν before ἐνί
 16 κενὰ κenoῖς
 17 om μὲν
 23 διήρειτο for διήρητο
 26 add καὶ before ἀπόστολος
 9.1 ἐαυτῶν for αὐτῶν
 6 om ἄνθρωπος
 11 ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις for τὸ γινόμενον
 12 om μὲν
 17 om εἰ before εἰπόντος
 add εἰ . . . μὴ ἀπέθνησκειν
 18 ἦν follows πάλιν
 23 om τοῦ
 24-27 om ἄλλως . . . ἀπάτην
 28 τοῦτου for τοιούτων
 10.1 αὐτοὺς for αὐτῶν (cf. 7.28)
 2 ταῦτα for αὐτὰ
 3 γενάμενα for γενόμενα
 5 θείου for θεοῦ
 6 εἰπερ for ἥπερ
 om τὴν before ἀρχὴν
 7 om μὲν (cf. 8.17, 14.16)
 12 om τοῦτο
 14 τοῦτο precedes ἔδει
 πάλιν for καὶ
 15 om πάλιν after ἐναντίων
 20 om ποιῆσαι
 21 τοὺς ἀνθρώπους follows μετά-
 νοιαν
 22 add εἶναι before θεοῦ λέγων
 24 πάλιν ἂν γένοιτο
 26 δὲ for γὰρ
 27-28 om δὲ ἡ μετάνοια
 30 μὴ added above the line
 11.7-8 καὶ τὸ φθαρτὸν πάλιν
 8 εἰσενεγκεῖν
 11 ἀνακτῆσαι
 14 δὲ for δὴ
 16 add τὸ before πρότερον
 18 ὑπὲρ for διὰ
 26 om ἦν
 12.2 ἐνέγκας for ἐνέγκων
 7 ἠθέλησεν for ἠθέλε
 7-8 om ἐδύνατο . . . τοῦ φανῆναι
 8 ἐπιφάνειαν for θεοφάνειαν
 11 add καὶ before ἀνδρὸς

- 12 δὲ for γάρ
 18 αὐτὸ corrected to αὐτῷ
 προσθήγαγε
 21 add αὐτοῦ before τῆς ἐξουσίας
 25 ἐπιστρέψῃ corrected above
 the line to ἐπιστρέψει
 27 ὥσπερ for ὡς
 30 πάντας for πάντως
 12.30-13.1 add ἐν αὐτῷ after ἀποθα-
 νεῖν
 13.4 μεταλαβὼν for μεταλαβὼν
 ὥσει ἔριον for ὡς ἱερεῖον
 om δ
 12 add καὶ before τὸν ἑαυτοῦ
 14 ὡς for οὕτως
 15 add δὲ after συνών
 23 ἀξιούται for καταξιούται
 27 παντὸς for πάντων
 σωτήρης for βασιλέως
 28 om αὐτοῦ
 28 εἰς for ἐπὶ
 14.5 add ὁ before τοῦ θεοῦ
 παραγεγόνει for παρεγεγόνει
 (ει inked over)
 13 ἑαυτῷ for ἑαυτοῦ
 14 πατὴρ θεὸς λόγος
 16 om μὲν
 18 διορθώσατο corrected to διωρ-
 θώσατο
 19 om τῶν
 23 θεοῦ for Χριστοῦ
 συνέχει for συνέχει
 24 om εἰ
 26 οἱ ζῶντες for ἡμεῖς
 ζῶσιν for ζῶμεν
 27 αὐτῶν for ἡμῶν
 ἐγερθέντι for ἀναστάντι
 15.3 τοῦ θεοῦ for θεὸν
 10 om καὶ
 19 om καὶ
 23 κεράτηκεν for ἐκράτησε
 31 περιμένωμεν
 16.3 om τοῦ σωτήρος
 7 om τῶν
 9 ἦν for εἶη
 αὐτῆς for ἑαυτῆς
 14 κατάλψιν letter erased be-
 fore ψ
 17 ἀνώνητον for ἀνόνητον (cf.
 19.21)
 ἔχασιν ω inked over followed
 by erasure, probably cor-
 rected from ἔχουσιν
 23 ἤθελεν for ἠθέλησεν
 29 δι' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς
 17.1 add τὸν before μακάριον
 14 ἀνηγόρευον ο blurred, perhaps
 corrected from ω
 15 ἑαυτῶν for αὐτῶν
 15-16 ἀλόγων ζῶων
 17 ἀπετέλουν for ἐπετέλουν
 18 ὑστερήμασιν for οἰστρήμασι
 19 μαγίαι
 21 ἀπεπλάνα for ἐπλάνα
 24 ὅλως ἦν πάντα
 26 ἐγινώσκετο for ἐπεγινώσκετο
 καίτοι ἑαυτὸν οὐκ ἀφανῆ
 18.2 τοῦ θεοῦ for θεόν (cf. 5.5)
 4 εἰ μὲν for ἐὰν
 4-5 ἀμελήσειεν
 7 ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἀμέλεια
 10 ἔμνητοῦ for αὐτοῖς
 11 ἐπὶ for εἰς
 δκνήσουσι corrected above
 line to δκνήσωσι
 14 παρὰ for περὶ
 17 add τὸν δημιουργὸν καὶ before
 τὸν ταύτης ἡγεμόνα
 τὴν for τῇ
 18 προνοία corrected to πρόνοιαν
 (to agree with preceding
 τὴν)

- 18-19 τὸν πατέρα πᾶσιν
 19 τοῦτο for τοῦτο
 20 γινώσκουσιν corrected to γινώ-
 σκωσιν
 21 αὐτοῖς for αὐτοῖς
 21-22 ἐντυγχάνειν for συντυγχάνειν
 24 θρησκεία (ει inked over)
 27 add τοὺς before Ἰουδαίους
 31 διδασκαλεῖον (ει inked over)
 19.5 add καὶ before πρὸς
 καὶ for ἀλλ'
 14 γινώσκειν for γινώσκειν
 16 om θεοῦ
 17 om τῶν
 18 ἦν ὅλως
 21 ὠφέλος for ὄφελος (cf. 16.17)
 22 om θεῷ ἡ
 add δὲ before δόξα
 23 αὐτὸν for αὐτῷ
 26 βασιλευμεν (sic) corrected to
 βασιλεὺς μὲν
 27-28 ἐτέροις ἐκδότους
 20.1 γένοιτο for γένηται
 λοιπὸν (οιπ inked over)
 2 δουλεύουσιν corrected to δον-
 λεύωσιν
 4 φείσεται (ει inked over)
 10 ἀνασῶσαι for ἀνανεῶσαι
 11 γνῶναι πάλιν αὐτὸν
 12 om εἰ
 13 om Ἰησοῦ
 19 ἐγένετο for ἐγεγόνει
 20 ἐξαφανισθεῖσα (σα inked over)
 22 om λοιπὸν
 om οἱ
 23 add οἱ before ἀνθρωποι
 24 τὴν χρεῖαν ταύτην
 26 add ἡ before χρεῖα
 27 τούτου for τοῦτον
 om ἡ
 28 add καὶ before ἀνακαινισθῆναι
 29-30 ἐνθα ἀναγέγραπται for ἐν ἡ καὶ
 γέγραπται
 21.3 ἀπολλόμενον (but 2nd λ is
 inked over)
 5 ἀπολλόμενον (but 2nd λ is
 inked over)
 9 om καὶ ἀνακτιζομένην
 12 ἐκρύπτετο for ἐκέκρυπτο
 13 add τοῦ before πατρός
 14 ἀνθρώπου for ἀνθρώπων
 om ἐνὸν
 ὑφ' ἡλίω for ὑφ' ἡλιον
 16 τοῦτο for τοῦτου
 19 παραχθέντων for παραχθέντων
 20 om τῶν
 25-27 om ἦν γὰρ . . . ἐκυλιντο
 22.4 ἕξων for ἐξόν
 6 om τοῦτο
 7 περιεῖδον for παρῖδον
 om καὶ
 12 after ἔργων add τὴν διδασ-
 καλίαν ποιεῖται περιπολῶν
 ὡς ἡλῖος διὰ τῶν ἐν σώματι
 ἔργων
 13 ἡγεμονίας corrected above
 line to ἡγεμονίας
 14 γνῶσιν for γνῶσονται
 om τῷ
 18 ἐκ for διὰ
 20 om καὶ
 om γὰρ
 22 ἡυδόκησεν
 27 θνητοὺς ἀνθρώπους
 23.2 προλαμβάνει (cf. 8.13)
 4 νοήσωσι, ω rewritten, perhaps
 originally ου
 5 λογίσωνται, ω rewritten, per-
 haps originally ο
 6 ὡς for οἷς
 7 ἐπέβαλλον
 7-8 προλαμβανομένους

- 8 ἑώρουν for ἐώρων
 10 ἐώρουν for ἐώρων
 13 τὰ for τε
 14 om ἐν ἀνθρώποις
 14-15 υἱὸς θεοῦ
 16 γεγόνει for γέγονεν
 18 τοῦτον εἶναι
 24 om τὸν κύριον ἀληθινὸν τὸν
 26 ἀνθρώποις for ἄνθρωπος
 29 προλη . . φθέντες, erasure between η and φ
 24.5 add εἰς before ἄνθρωπον
 7 ἀποκλείνη for ἀποκλίνη
 9 αὐτὸν for ἐαυτὸν
 om μόνον after ἄνθρωπον
 om καὶ
 10 add τοῦ before ἀληθινοῦ
 14 om καὶ βάθος
 16 ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα
 18 καὶ εἰς τὸ πλάτος καὶ εἰς τὸ βάθος
 20 om εἰς . . . κόσμον
 22 δὴ for δέ
 παραγενάμενος for παραγενόμενος (cf. 10.3)
 add εἰς before τὴν θυσίαν
 23 ἦν for τὴν
 25-26 καθίστησιν
 28-29 ἐφίλανθρωπεύεται
 25.2-3 after εἶναι add θεοῦ υἱόν· καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι
 4 om δὴ
 περικεκλησμένος corrected above line to περικεκλεισμένος
 6 ἐκείναι with ε erased
 7 κεκένωντο erasure after first ε
 12 om εἰς πάντα
 21 om μὲν
 om ἰδίου
 28-29 γιγνόμενα for γεγονότα
 31 σώματι for ἀνθρώπων
 add ἐν before τῷ σώματι
 26.2 ἐξωθεν for ἐξω
 ὅλων for ὄντων
 3 om μόνω
 5 ἅπαντα for τὰ πάντα
 5-6 συνῆν τῷ πατρὶ
 9 add τὰ before πάντα
 11 om ὁ
 11-12 om καὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ὁρώμενος
 14 om αὐτὸς
 16 om ὁ καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου ποιητῆς καὶ κύριος
 17 ἐρυναινετο
 19 ἐκαθέριζεν
 22 αἰσθίοντα for ἐσθίοντα
 26.28-27.5 om λέγεται . . . ἐγνώριζεν and add φιλάνθρωπος γὰρ ὢν καὶ ἀγαθοῦ πατρὸς υἱὸς μονογενὴς οὐδὲν ἔρημον ἑαυτοῦ κατελίμπανεν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν ἀοράτοις ἀοράτως διὰ τῆς εἰς τὴν κτίσιν ἑαυτοῦ προνοίας ἐγίνωσκετο. τοῖς δὲ ἀνθρώποις καταπερισσὸν διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος ἐγνώριζεν τὸν πατέρα. τῇ τε θεῷ αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίᾳ. καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις ἑαυτὸν ἐμφαίνων εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ
 27.6 διὰ τοῦτο for ὅθεν
 7-8 om εἰ οὐ ποιῶ . . . εἰ δὲ ποιῶ
 8 πιστεύετε for πιστεύητε
 9 πιστεύετε for πιστεύσατε
 9-10 om ἵνα γινώτε . . . τῷ πατρὶ
 10 ὥσπερ for ὡς
 11 γινώσκετε corrected above line to γινώσκεται
 12 om μὴ
 17 om τὸ

- εἰδὼν for ἰδὼν
 om ἰώμενον
 18 ὑπέκειτο for ὑπόκειται
 add θεραπευόμενον before ἔτι
 21 πᾶσαν for πάσας
 νόσον for νόσους
 23 add δυνατὸν before τὴν
 θεϊότητα for θεότητα
 24 εἰδὼν corrected to ἰδὼν
 om αὐτὸν
 25 τοὺς for τοῦ
 τυφλοὺς for τυφλοῦ
 om τοὺς before ὀφθαλμοὺς
 26 ἀνύγοντα for ἀνοίγοντα
 add τῶν before ἀνθρώπων
 26-27 γένεσιν ὑποκειμένην αὐτῷ
 28 om ὁ
 29-30 ὁ διδοὺς κύριος ὢν τῆς γενέσεως
 for ὅτι . . . τῆς γενέσεως
 28.1 παρερχόμενος for κατερχόμενος
 εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους τόπους for
 πρὸς ἡμᾶς
 3 θεϊότητος for θεότητος
 4 add ὁ before ποιητῆς
 5 εἰδὼν for ἰδὼν (cf. 27. 17, 24)
 7 om εἶναι
 8 ἰδὼν inked over, probably
 originally εἰδὼν (cf. 28.5)
 9 μεταβάλλουσιν
 13 πάντων for πάντα
 δεσποτίας for δεσποτείας
 17 τοσοῦτον for τοσοῦτο
 add ἦν after ἕτερον
 18 τὸν καὶ
 ἔνα κύριον γνωρίζειν for κύριον
 ἐγνωρίζε
 19 ποιεῖν πάντα
 22 ἐκ for διὰ
 θεϊότητα for θεότητα
 26 εἰδὼν erased to ἰδὼν
 27 εἰδὼν erased to ἰδὼν
 28 τοῦτον αὐτῶν for τούτων αὐτὸν
 29 ἔχει for ἔξει
 30 add οὐδὲ after γὰρ
 29.4 ὁμολογεῖ for ὁμολόγει
 5 οὐκ ἄνθρωπον εἶναι for οὐχ
 ἀπλῶς εἶναι ἄνθρωπον
 6 λόγον for υἱὸν
 7 ἐσίετο
 ἐρήγνυτο
 8 add καὶ before πάντες
 9 ἐδείκνυνεν for ἐδείκνυνον
 10 εἶναι δούλην
 14 ἀγωγῆς for διαγωγῆς
 15 ὁποῖον for ὁποῖος
 τὸ τέλος τοῦ σώματος for ὁ τοῦ
 σώματος θάνατος
 16 ἡμῶν τῆς πίστεως
 17 add οἱ before ἄνθρωποι
 20-21 ἐπιφανίας for ἐπιφανεῖας
 21 οἶα for οἶον
 23 ἐνεγκεῖν for μεταβαλεῖν
 24 add κατὰ before τὴν ἀρχὴν
 28 ἀναστῆσαι for παραστήσαι
 30 add τῶν before εἰδῶλων
 θρησκίαν for θρησκείαν
 30.3 παρὰ πάντων for πάντας (cf.
 preceding line)
 4 om δι' ὁ . . . ἐπεδήμησε
 5 θεϊότητος for θεότητος
 6 om λοιπὸν
 om τὴν
 12-18 om καὶ μήτοι . . . γραφῆναι
 19 γὰρ for οὖν
 20 καὶ εἰ
 21 παρθένου, θ above line.
 ἦν καὶ for ὅν
 31.1 οὐκ for οὐχ
 4 περὶ for ὑπὲρ
 5 τὸ σῶμα ἰδιοποίησιν for ἐπί-
 βασιν
 6 om τουτέστι

- 13 om πιστοί
 14 om παυομένης καὶ
 15 ἐπαγγελία for χάριτι
 καὶ for κατὰ
 16 διαλυόμενον for διαλυόμεθα
 om μόνον
 om ὁ before θεός
 18 δυνήθωσιν for δυνήθωμεν
 20 ἐγειρόμεθα for ἀναστήσόμεθα
 24 ἐνδύσεται for ἐνδύσασθαι
 27-28 after θάνατε add τὸ νίκος; ποῦ
 σου ἄδη
 30 add καὶ before οὐχ
 31 μέχρις for μέχρι
 ἐκείνως for ἐντίμως
 32.2 ἥπερ corrected above line to
 εἴπερ
 om τοιοῦτον
 3 δὲ for δὴ
 5 θεϊότητος for θεότητος
 7 om αὐτοῖς
 9 γοῦν for γὰρ
 11 ἀσθενήσας for ἀσθενής
 12 ζῶν for αὐτοζῶν
 om ἦν before ἰδίᾳ
 13-14 ἀποθέμενος ἦν ἐν κλίνῃ τὸ σῶμα
 16 πλεον ἔχων
 17 λόγος θεοῦ
 19 ἑαυτῷ for αὐτῷ
 22 οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ for ἐπεὶ μηδὲ
 24 πάλιν ἔδει
 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ for ἐν ᾧ
 24-25 τὰς ἄλλας ἀσθενείας for τὰς τῶν
 ἄλλων ἀσθενείας
 25 ἰσχυροποιῶντι for ἰσχυροποιεῖ
 32.25-33.15 om διὰ τί . . . Ἰουδαί-
 οὺς ἔφυγε and add διὰ
 τοῦτο οὐκ ἰδίῳ. ἀλλὰ τῷ
 παρ' ἐτέρων διδομένῳ θα-
 νάτῳ τὸ σῶμα προσενεγ-
 κέν· διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐκρύβη
 τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν τῶν Ἰου-
 δαίων, ἵνα καθόλου τὸν ναὸν
 ἀθάνατον φυλάξῃ· ὅτι καὶ
 τοῦτο ἀπρεπὲς ἦν τῷ κυρίῳ.
 οὐκ ἔπρεπε γὰρ τῷ τοῦ
 θεοῦ λόγῳ ζῶν ὄντι οὔτε τὸ
 σῶμα αὐτοῦ θάνατον παρ'
 ἑαυτοῦ διδόναι, οὔτε τὸν
 παρ' ἐτέρων γινόμενον φεί-
 γειν. καὶ μὴ μᾶλλον διώ-
 κειν αὐτὸν εἰς ἀναίρεσιν ὅθεν
 εἰκότως οὔτε ἑαυτῷ ἀπέθετο
 τὸ σῶμα, οὐδὲ πάλιν ἐπι-
 βουλείοντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους
 ἔφευγεν· ζῶν γὰρ ὢν· οὐκ
 ἤφιεν ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου βλα-
 βῆναι τὸ σῶμα. ἀλλὰ καὶ
 μᾶλλον ἐξηφάνιζεν αὐτὸν ἐν
 τῷ σῶματι·
 33.17 om καὶ σωτήρα
 17-20 om ὅτι καὶ . . . τελειῶσαι and
 add καὶ τὸ γινόμενον ὑπὲρ
 τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας τελει-
 ούμενον
 26 εἶδοι corrected to ἴδοι
 τοιοῦτο for τοιοῦτον
 τὸ follows τοιοῦτο
 ἡυρηκέναι for ἐσχηκέναι
 28 τὸ for τοῦτο
 29 om ἦν
 ἦλθεν for ταύτην
 33.30-34.1 γεναμένην for γενομένην
 (cf. 10.3)
 34.2 ἀφθαρσιαν, ν nearly erased
 ἦν for ἦς
 3 πάντας for πάντων
 om ἀναστάσεως
 4 om ἑαυτοῦ
 add διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ
 after σῶμα
 5 διαλυθὲν for διαλυθεὶς

- 6 om ὁ λόγος
 8 δ' for γὰρ
 12 add γενόμενος before ἐνομίζετο
 13-14 χωρίς νόσου καὶ τινος ἀλγηδόνας
 15 om ἐν
 17 φανείς for φανείς
 om ἐκ νεκρῶν
 21 ἐπειδὴ for ἐπεὶ
 23 γέγονει for ἐγγέγονει
 24 τοῦ θανάτου τούτου
 28 ἤλανθεν for ἀπήλανθεν
 καὶ τὸν for τὸν τε
 30 οἶνον for οἶν (misprint in
 edition?)
 θεοῦ λόγος
 35.2 αὐτὸς θεοῦ λόγος καὶ ζωὴ ὢν
 οὖν for δὲ καὶ
 3 add ἐν τῷ before περὶ
 4 λόγῳ for λόγου
 5 ἐπεὶ for ἥ
 γεγενῆσθαι for γεγονέναι
 7 τοὺς for τούτους
 8-13 om εἰ γὰρ . . . ἀπιστίας
 13 om ἄρα
 15 προκαλεσάμενος for προσκαλε-
 σάμενος
 16 add καὶ before κενωθέντα
 22 om αὐτὸν
 om ἐνδοξον
 add τοιοῦτον before θάνατον
 (cf. 33.26 τὸ τοιοῦτο τέλος)
 23 om εἰ
 24 ποιῶν for ποιήσας
 τὴν for ἥν
 25 add κατὰ before μόνον
 26 παρ' αὐτοῦ for περὶ αὐτοῦ
 28 ἐγίγνετο for ἐγένετο
 30 om θάνατον
 36.1 ἀθλητὴς for παλαιστής
 ῥώμῃ for συνέσει
 3 τίνα for τίνας
 4 παρέχῃ for παρασχῇ
 5 ἂν for ἔαν
 6 συμβαλῶ . . . σιν, probably cor-
 rected from συμβάλουσιν
 8 ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησοῦς
 ὁ Χριστὸς
 9 ἐπινοεῖ for ἐπενόει
 11-12 εἶναι δεινὸν καὶ πικρὸν ἐν σταυρῷ
 τούτῳ ἐδέχετο for εἶναι
 δεινὸν . . . ἡνέχετο
 13 om καὶ
 εἶναι for μὲν ὦν
 36.14-38.18 om τοῦ δὲ θανάτου . . .
 καὶ γὰρ and add καὶ μη-
 δεὶς ἔτι λοιπὸν ἀμφιβάλλῃ· εἰ
 κατήργηται τέλος ὁ θάνα-
 τος καὶ κατ' αὐτοῦ κεκρά-
 τηκεν ἡ ζωὴ. δεινοῦ γὰρ
 ὄντος καὶ ἀτίμου θανάτου
 παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῦ
 σταυροῦ τούτου προσήγον
 καὶ ἑκὼν αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος
 ἐδέχετο τούτον· ἵνα ἐν
 τούτῳ τὸν θάνατον καταρ-
 γήσῃ· καὶ πιστευσθῇ λοιπὸν
 καὶ τέλος ἡ κατὰ τοῦ θανά-
 του παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένη
 νίκη. διὰ ταύτην τοίνυν τὴν
 αἰτίαν· οὐ νόσῳ διὰ τὸ ἄπρε-
 πες· οὐκ ἰδίᾳ διὰ τὸ ἀπίθα-
 νον· οὐχ ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐπενόησεν
 θάνατον· διὰ τὰς τῶν ἀπισ-
 τῶν ὑπονοίας· ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐξ
 ἐπιβουλῆς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐδέ-
 χετο τὸ σῶμα θάνατον· καὶ
 ὑψηλῶς καὶ ἐπλημένως ἐσ-
 ταυροῦτο· ἵνα τοῦ θανάτου
 πᾶσιν φανερωθέντος· φα-
 νερὰ πᾶσιν καὶ ἡ τούτου
 ἀνάστασις διαβηθῇ καὶ πισ-
 τευθῇ· πάσῃ μὲν γὰρ τὸ

σῶμα καὶ αὐτὴν τῶν σωμάτων φύσιν ἀπέθνησκειν, εἶχεν δὲ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τὴν πίστιν ἐκ τοῦ συνοικήσαντος αὐτῷ λόγου· οὐ γὰρ ἀποθνήσκοντος τοῦ σώματος ἐνεκροῦτο καὶ ὁ λόγος· ἀλλ' ἦν (sic) μὲν αὐτὸς ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀφθαρτος καὶ ἀθάνατος· οἷα δὲ θεοῦ λόγος ὑπάρχων· συνὼν δὲ τῷ σώματι. μᾶλλον διεκώλυεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν κατὰ φύσιν τῶν σωμάτων φθορὰν ἢ φησὶν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα πρὸς αὐτὸν· οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὁσίον σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. τὸ μὲν οὖν σῶμα ἅτε δὴ σῶμα ὃν ἀνθρώπινον ὡς προείπον ἐνεκροῦτο τῇ τοῦ λόγου θελήσει· αὐτὸς δὲ θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεοῦ σοφία καὶ λόγος ὢν καὶ τῶν πάντων αὐτὸς ζῶν

- 38.19 μὲν ἀφανῆ
 24 τριταῖον (αι inked over)
 εἰθὺς for εὐθέως
 25 add τοῖς ἀνθρώποις after φέρων
 add αὐτοῦ after σώματι
 29 προειδῶς for προῖδῶν
 39.3 ἄδηλος for ἄδηλον
 4 ἐγίνετο τῆς ἀφθαρσίας ἢ χάρις
 for ἐγίνετο . . . κλέος
 11 ἀπιστεῖν (ει inked over)
 12 ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι for ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι
 17 ἀπηρτημένης for ἡρτημένης
 25 after σωτήρος add τούτου δὲ
 γενομένου· οὐκ ἦν ἀμφίβολον τὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐνεργοῦντα καὶ περιπολοῦντα μὴ ἀνθρώπον εἶναι. ἀλλὰ θεόν

λόγον καὶ τῶν πάντων τῇ ζωῇ· τῶν δὲ τηλικούτων καγορθωμάτων οὐκ ἀφανῆς ἀλλ' ἐναργής ἐστίν ἡ πίστις·

- 27 om τὸν before σταυρὸν
 40.1 καταφρονεῖσθαι (ει inked over)
 2-3 om τοῦ σταυροῦ
 3 τὸν σταυρὸν for Χριστὸν
 4 om γὰρ
 5-6 om φοβερὸς . . . θάνατος
 6 πάντας for πάντες
 9 om τῷ
 13 om καὶ before ζῶσιν
 14-17 om ἐκεῖνος . . . ὅτι
 17 add ἢ διὰ τί before πρὶν
 add μὲν after πρὶν
 πιστεύουσιν
 19 om πίστιν καὶ
 21 ἐπιβαίνειν for ὁρμᾶν
 23 γενέσθαι for γίνεσθαι
 νίκης for ἀναστάσεως
 add καὶ before ἔτι
 25-28 om οὐ μόνον . . . παρειμένον
 and add εἰδότες ὅτι πάσης ἰσχύος κεκένωνται καὶ λοιπὸν αὐτὸς ἐστὶν νεκρὸς
 41.1 τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας
 9 ἐπιμαρτυροῦντες for ἐπικερτομῶντες
 11 θάνατε for ἄδη
 13 τούτου for τοῦ θανάτου
 14 νίκης γενομένης
 19 ἐστὶ τούτου
 om τοῦ
 20 om 1st καὶ before τῶν
 23 om καὶ before μᾶλλον
 24 δεικνύων for δεικνύον
 28 om τοῦ
 30 νικήσαντος for νικησάντων
 31 ἄλλως for ἄλλοις

- 42.2 om καὶ
 3 γιγνόμενην
 5 εἰ ὅμως ἔτι (ἔτι rewritten)
 9 ἐνέργη corrected to ἐνάργη
 above line
 10 γιγνώσκει
 15 θανατ . . . (the rest is
 blurred)
 19 add τῆς before τοῦ Χριστοῦ
 after τοῦ Χριστοῦ add κατὰ
 τοῦ θανάτου νίκης
 21 add τὸν before Χριστὸν
 43.1 add ὁ before ἥλιος
 2 περιγίεος, εἰ inked over
 6 om καὶ καταπατηθέντος
 7 γεγένηται for γέγονεν
 8 om τὸ
 12 ἴδοι for ἴδη
 13 προπηδώντας (ω inked over)
 13-14 καταπτήξαντας for καταπτήσ-
 σοντας
 16 καταπτήξαντας for πτήσσοντας
 τὰς βασάνους
 19 τις θεωρὸς
 παιδίων for παίδων
 22 τίς ἐστιν οὕτως
 28 two letters before καὶ which
 cannot be read, prob-
 ably stained through
 from 37.4
 add καὶ after γὰρ
 44.1 ἐξησθένηκεν for ἐξησθένησεν
 8 ἐν Χριστῷ for εἰς Χριστὸν
 add εἰς θεὸν before πιστευόν-
 των
 10 add τοῦ before Χριστοῦ
 καταργεῖται for κατήργηται
 11 om καὶ πέπανται
 15 ἀθανάτου λοιπὸν ἀναστάσεως
 16 κυρίου for κοινοῦ
 add τοῦ before πάντων
 om καὶ
 ὄντος for ὄντως
 18 om τῆς διανοίας
 19-20 ὡς ἔδειξεν ὁ λόγος
 21 πρῶτον for πρῶτος
 24 τοῦ θανάτου for αὐτοῦ
 25 om γὰρ
 27 om ἡ
 28 γινομένων for γενομένων
 30 σώματος for μηνήματος
 45.1 αὐτῷ ἐστιν
 1-2 text of ms. ends with μόνων
 δὲ τῶν ζώντων

NOTES

THE RABBINIC LAW PRESUPPOSED BY MATTHEW XII. 1, AND LUKE VI. 1

SINCE John Lightfoot's contributions to the interpretation of the New Testament from Rabbinic sources a large literature has grown up on the subject, and in Strack and Billerbeck's recent commentary on the gospels an immense amount of erudition is stored up. Yet in spite of the invaluable labors of these scholars more light can still be thrown on the understanding of the New Testament from the study of the halakah underlying it.

In Matthew 12, 1 f., and similarly in Luke 6, 1 f., we read:

At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the corn, and his disciples were hungry and began to pluck the ears of corn and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto him: 'Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath day.'

It is rather strange that the Pharisees are merely represented as rebuking Jesus for allowing his disciples to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath, but are not described as raising any objection to the act of his followers in plucking grain in a field that is not theirs.

With reference to the gospel narrative of the encounter of Jesus with the Pharisees it is important to recall the ancient halakah which permitted anyone to enter the field of another and eat of its fruit while there. That is in accordance with Deut. 23, 25 f., which allowed one to enter another's vineyard and partake of its grapes.¹ This natural interpretation is also found in the Talmud, Baba Mezia 92a, where we read:

Rab says, I have found a secret scroll² of the school of Rabbi Hiyya in which it was written: Isai ben Judah says, The verse, 'When thou comest in the vineyard of thy neighbor, then thou mayest eat grapes until thou have enough and thine own pleasure,' extends the privilege to all.³

In much later times, most probably in consequence of changes in the economic conditions of Jewish life, the law on this point was modi-

¹ Driver, Commentary on Deuteronomy, 1895, p. 269.

² According to Halberstam's view, quoted by Marx, Jewish Quarterly Review, n. s., XIII, 353, these were note-books used by scholars, in which the teachings of the oral law were written down for private use.

³ This view is also presupposed by Josephus, Ant. iv. 8, 21 and by the regulation attributed to Joshua that one may pluck herbs everywhere, as recorded in Baba Kama 81a; see M. Bloch, Shaare Torat Hatakanot, volume I, Vienna, 1879, pp. 56-58.

fied so as to prohibit one from entering another's field with the view of enjoying any of its produce. Accordingly the rabbis interpreted Deut. 23, 25 f. to apply only to the laborer, who was to be permitted to partake of the crops while working for his master. The earliest authority who mentions this new ordinance is Akabiah ben Mahalalel, who lived at the beginning of the second century.⁴

Hence it would appear that the author of the New Testament passage in question was acquainted with the older Jewish tradition only, and this explains the fact that the Pharisees did not find fault with the conduct of Jesus on the ground of trespass.

BOAZ COHEN

JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA
NEW YORK

⁴ Midrash Tannaim (ed. Hoffmann), p. 153; Sifre (ed. Friedmann), p. 121b; Baba Mezia 87b. The later halakah is supposed to be reflected in the story of Reuben, who went out to pick 'dudaim' only at the time of harvest, when this was permitted to everyone; see Sanhedrin 99b, and Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, I, 366; V, 298 note 190; cf. Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan to Deut. 23, 25.